

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. XLVIII, No. 20
WHOLE No. 1221

February 18, 1933

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	465-468
EDITORIALS	
Our New President—Catholic Social Science— The Red Motor Car—The Governors' Meeting —Is Congress Corrupt?—A Formula for Fame	469-471
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Shall We Recognize Russia?—The Testimony of Bernadette—The Failure of a Bicentennial at Washington	472-478
BACK OF BUSINESS.....	479
EDUCATION	
College Dramatics	479-480
SOCIOLOGY	
Religion and Crime Statistics.....	480-482
POETRY	
Theology—Granada	478;482
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF.....	482-483
LITERATURE	
The Poet's Diction	484-485
REVIEWS	485-487
COMMUNICATIONS	488

Chronicle

Home News.—On February 2, the Senate Finance Committee invited fifty-five leaders in economics, business, and finance to present their views on the causes of the depression and to offer constructive plans for relief, the hearings to begin February 13.

Congress 13.—On February 7, after several days of heated discussion, the Senate, fifty-three to seventeen, expelled David S. Barry, its sergeant-at-arms, for an article he had written for the *New Outlook*, in which he stated that "there are not many Senators or Representatives who sell their vote for money, and it is pretty well known who these few are." He had been suspended on February 3, and questioned by the Senate, which demanded that he name any Congressmen he knew who had sold their votes. He declined to do this. The Senate was reported to be considering libel action against Mr. Barry and the *New Outlook*.—On February 7, the Senate voted almost dictatorial powers to the President-elect to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. He would be empowered to carry out consolidations and eliminations by Executive Orders, which would take effect sixty days after their transmission to Congress while in session. To disapprove any reorganization, Congress would have to pass a legislative act, which would be sub-

ject to a Presidential veto. The measure was embodied in the Treasury-Postoffice appropriation bill and sent to the House, where leaders were preparing to take quick action. On February 7, the Senate Agriculture Committee had completed hearings and was preparing to rewrite the House domestic-allotment bill. It was generally conceded, however, that farm-relief legislation would not materialize in this Congress but would await the expected special session.—On February 8, Democratic Representatives in caucus decided, 161 to 4, to vote against the Crowther bill, which would provide for automatic tariff adjustments on imports from countries with depreciated currencies.

On February 2, President-elect Roosevelt announced that soon after his inauguration he intended to ask for a survey of a development plan of the Tennessee River watershed, to link water power, flood control, reforestation, agriculture, and industry in a vast experiment for unemployment relief and to restore the balance between urban and rural populations. He said that if successful the plan would be self-sustaining, would put 200,000 men to work, and would probably be the forerunner of similar projects in other parts of the country. The next day Mr. Roosevelt left for a ten-day cruise on Vincent Astor's yacht, *Nourmahal*. On February 7 it was announced that the President-elect had invited the Governors of all the States to discuss with him, at the White House on March 6, ways and means of solving conflicting taxation by Federal and State governments, Federal aid for unemployment relief, mortgage foreclosures, better land use by afforestation, elimination of marginal agriculture land, flood prevention, and other national problems that might come up.

Argentina.—No little apprehension was felt throughout Argentina after the statement of the Minister of Agriculture on February 8 regarding damaged crops. He stated that drought and locusts had destroyed more than twenty-five per cent of the country's fourteen-million-acre corn crop now maturing. This would leave the harvestable crop at 10,625,000 acres, the smallest in years.

Bolivia.—In an effort to reattack Fort Nanawa, it was reported on February 8, General Hans Kundt, Commander of the Bolivian forces in the Gran Chaco region, had assembled a new army of 18,000 men. Should he succeed in retaking Nanawa, General Kundt planned to move northward to Falcon, where two Bolivian armies would be ready

to attack Arce and Alihuata. In the recent twenty-day assault in the Nanawa, Corrales, and Herrera sectors, the Bolivian losses were estimated to be about 15,000, including dead, wounded, and those taken prisoner.

Germany.—The new Hitler Government began a policy of Communist repression on February 2, by forbidding outdoor demonstrations and by ordering the close supervision of indoor meetings. Simultaneously the Government ordered local authorities to search the homes of Communist leaders throughout the Reich. The National Socialists clamored for the complete outlawing of the Communist party. In Berlin, the Charlottenburg district was put into a state of siege after the shooting of a Nazi trooper; police cleared the district of pedestrians and threatened to shoot anyone who appeared at the windows of the houses. In the Ruhr district, eleven Socialists were wounded after a huge parade. On the following day the newspaper *Vorwärts*, the Socialist party's national organ, was confiscated by the police and its publication was suspended for three days because it had printed an election manifesto which carried a passage violating the statutes for the maintenance of law and order. The death toll since the accession of Hitler rose to twenty when on February 3 three anti-Fascists were killed in Berlin in a clash with Nazi supporters. In Munich, the former Abbot of Emaus, Father Alban Schachleiter, was summoned before the diocesan courts; it was reported that he had contributed an article to one of the Hitler organs advocating the National Socialist movement.

Violence Rises
On February 4, the Prussian Diet refused to declare itself dissolved; the National Socialist motion calling for dissolution was rejected during a stormy session by a vote of 214 to 196, the Communists joining the Centrists, Democrats, and Socialists in the voting. When the issue was then referred to a triumvirate having constitutional power to override the Diet vote, the measure was again defeated, 2 to 1, Herr Kerl, Nazi President of the Diet, dissenting. On February 6, however, President von Hindenburg invested Vice-Chancellor Von Papen with complete ministerial powers as Reich Commissioner for Prussia. Von Papen immediately summoned the triumvirate for another vote, and when Dr. Adenauer, the Centrist President of the Prussian State Council, refused to respond on the grounds that the Von Hindenburg decree was unconstitutional, Colonel Von Papen cast his vote with Herr Kerl. Thus the Diet was dissolved and, as observers stated, the last remnants of Prussia's rights as an autonomous State were decreed away by the arbitrary action of the President.

Prussian Diet Dissolved
As the nation entered upon the campaign for the elections of March 5, violence began afresh with frequent clashes between Nazis and Socialists or Nazis and Communists. The President issued a new decree drastically curbing newspaper criticism of Hitler during the campaign. On February 7, the permanent committee of the Prussian

State Diet agreed to the Federal Government's proposal that the State election should be held on the same day as the Reichstag balloting.

Great Britain.—Official reports, as of January 23, showed that the number of registered unemployed was 2,903,065. This was an increase over the previous month of 179,778. Compared with the same time last year, it was an increase of 17,464; this number, however, did not represent the actual difference, since the introduction of the means test and other regulations held back many unemployed from registering for benefits and transitional aid. The decline in employment was largely in industries that regularly have a dull period in the winter months, though there was a decided drop in metal, cotton, and wool industries. In coal mining, there was some absorption of workers. Under the auspices of the Trades Union Congress and leaders of the Labor party, a huge demonstration was held in Hyde Park on February 5. About 70,000 workers paraded and double that number of onlookers assembled about the eight platforms and in the vicinity. Resolutions were offered condemning the Government changes in the unemployment-insurance scheme, and the reduction of wages, and specifically demanding the abolition of the means test. Communists had threatened to turn the demonstration into a riot, but they confined their efforts to small counter-demonstrations.

Ireland.—In the opening session of the eighth Dail on February 8, Eamon de Valera was re-elected as President of the Free State Executive Council. His name was put in nomination by Sean Moylan, deputy from North Cork. William T. Cosgrave, opposition leader of Cumann na nGae-dheal, spoke against the nomination on the grounds that the Fianna Fail internal and external policies were interfering with prosperity, damaging trade, and disrupting national life, the while they were creating hostility in the Empire. The leader of the Center party, Frank McDermott, also opposed the nomination of Mr. de Valera; he paid tribute to the President and stated that his party was not against the aims so much as the methods of the De Valera Government. The vote was 82 to 54 in favor of Mr. de Valera; the Center party refrained from voting in the division. A short adjournment followed, during which Mr. de Valera sought the royal assent, according to the Constitution, of his election from the Governor General, Donal Buckley. Upon his return to the Dail, President de Valera announced his Cabinet. He himself retained the post of Minister for Foreign Affairs. Sean T. O'Kelly was again named Vice President and Minister for Local Government. James Geoghegan was left out of the Cabinet, his office of Minister for Justice being given to Patrick Rutledge; Joseph Connolly took Mr. Rutledge's place as Minister for Lands and Fisheries, and Gerald Boland succeeded Mr. Connolly as Minister for Posts and Telegraphs. It had been expected that Joseph Devlin and Cahir Healy, Nationalist members of the Parliament of

Fianna Fail Cabinet

Northern Ireland, would be introduced into the Dail at the opening session to make a plea for the ending of partition between the Free State and Northern Ireland. They were in Dublin for the opening of the Dail but did no more than hold private conferences with President de Valera and the Cabinet.

The strike affecting the Great Northern Railway tied up railroad communications between Belfast and the Free State, and in the Ulster territory. The cause of the strike, which began on January 30, was the refusal of the workers to accept a reduction in wages recommended by the Irish Railway Wages Board. The Free State Government prevented the strike in its territory by offering a subsidy sufficient to cover the amount of the reduction in wages. The Belfast Government refused to take such action, with the result that the workers refused to operate the railroads in the Northeastern area. Some service was maintained through motorcars and trucks.

Nicaragua.—On February 2, Gen. Augusto Sandino, who had been a Nicaraguan outlaw for more than five years, came to Managua by plane to enter into peace negotiations with President Juan B. Sacasa. The General in a press statement declared that with the departure of the United States Marines his work was finished and peace would now be a fact in his country. He expressed his confidence in the President's ability to guide the country during the reconstruction period. After his conference with the President, General Sandino returned to his headquarters in the mountains, where his officers and soldiers unanimously accepted the peace proposals he had secured.

Russia.—An order was issued conscripting all peasants in the Northern region under strictly military regime to speed up the production of lumber. A thirty-day period beginning February 7 was set aside by the Communist party in the Northern region for "Stalin's march to the forests." All able-bodied peasants were to be organized in brigades, and work in the villages left to women and children. Otherwise the lumber-export plan was threatened with total failure. In the meanwhile, deportations from the Leningrad district, on the new "passport" policy of evacuation, were said to reach the tens of thousands.

Uruguay.—In a fiery speech delivered at Rocha on February 3 President Terra stated that the refusal of Congress to heed the rapidly increasing demand for a plebiscite on Constitutional reform would lead to grave results. He declared that Uruguay's commission form of government had failed and that the time had come to rewrite the Constitution of 1917. The President's political opponents charged that his ultimate aim was to establish a military dictatorship.

Vatican City.—Congratulatory messages between Catholic dignitaries in the United States and in the Vatican were exchanged on January 24 by the radio-telegraph service newly inaugurated by the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation. The president of the American company sent radiograms to the Cardinal Secretary of State, the Governor of Vatican City, and to the director of the Vatican radio system. In response, Cardinal Pacelli, speaking over the new short-wave station, conveyed the blessing of the Holy Father to the Hierarchy of the United States.—In a front page editorial, *Osservatore Romano* discussed Technocracy, accusing it of forgetting the "moral and social elements which must predominate if the world wants true restoration."

International Economics.—The date of the World Economic Conference was postponed again. The committee charged therewith would meet again, it was stated, in May to fix the date or arrange further delay. Other uncertainty surrounded the future conference. At the same time, Neville Chamberlain, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, announced that Britain would not stabilize her currency until she was certain that the gold standard would work and until there had been "an international agreement as to conditions under which it shall be worked." Sir Robert Horne, former Chancellor of the Exchequer, urged a rise in the value of silver. The Federation of British Industries reported on February 8 against taking action on sterling until trade interests had been properly safeguarded.

Disarmament.—The French plan for organized Continental security, explained in the Disarmament Commission session on February 2 by René Massigli, met with some unexpected reactions. A statement from the Polish Foreign Minister, Joseph Beck, rejected the plan as too complicated, and as unsatisfactory to Great Britain, Italy, and Germany. On the other hand, the plan was warmly endorsed by Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Foreign Commissar, who announced that the Soviet union would ask formal repudiation of the reservations that "virtually nullify" the Kellogg-Briand treaty on outlawing war, and astonished the conference by proposing a definition of an aggressor nation that seemed almost a description of Japan in its Manchurian policy.

An aggressor State was defined as "one that invades by armed forces without declaration of war, or that bombards foreign territory, or lands forces in another territory without permission," or "establishes a naval blockade." "No considerations whatsoever should be accepted as justification of such aggression. Intervention cannot be based, for instance, upon "revolutionary disorders or strikes"; nor upon "religious or anti-religious measures, or frontier incidents," etc. Despite the high discount which was placed upon M. Litvinov's proposal,

Railway Strike

General Sandino Makes Peace

March to the Forests

Reform of Constitution

Radio Messages

Conference; Gold Standard

French Plan

Definition of Aggression

from its patent highly political bearing, a tendency was manifest to consider that it might pave the way towards a genuine definition of an aggressor. His proposal was favorably commented upon by Joseph Paul-Boncour.

Discussions were still rife as to the incident, by which 180,000 rifles, plus 200 machine guns had been shipped on December 30-31, 1932, to Hungary from Italy, via Hirtenberg in Austria. Attacks were made by Socialists upon Chancellor Dolfuss of Austria in the Parliament in Vienna for concealing the facts. At Geneva, M. Benes, of Czechoslovakia, demanded an investigation by the League or by the British and French Governments. At the same time, disquiet was expressed over Italy's interest in recent additional fortifications in Albania.

League of Nations.—After the League of Nations Committee of Nineteen had rejected on February 4 the conciliation offer of Japan as falling short of the basis needed for a settlement of the Manchurian conflict, it was unanimously agreed on February 6 to recommend not merely non-recognition of Manchukuo in law, but non-cooperation in practice. It was also unanimously agreed to recommend that the present situation in Manchuria was "incompatible" with the League covenant, the Pact of Paris, and the Nine-Power Treaty and that settlement of the Chino-Japanese conflict must be based on the ten conditions listed in Chapter IX of the Lytton report, as a "minimum" to be considered by the drafting committee. These conditions include regard for Soviet interests, Manchurian autonomy under Chinese sovereignty, withdrawal of Japanese forces, and international cooperation in the reconstruction of China.

Unexpected accessions to the League's fund of moral strength came from three sources. Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, endorsed the first part of the French arms plan, thus stigmatizing Japan as an aggressor. Anthony Eden, the chief British delegate, declared forcefully for the non-recognition of Manchukuo. René Massigli, for France, not only seconded this position, but urged also non-cooperation with Manchukuo, even going so far as to suggest that financial relations be forbidden. Recent events in Germany were credited with this stiffening of attitude among the great Powers. Unsuccessful attempts then followed from the Japanese side to have proposals adopted using wording from the Lytton report but saving Manchukuo and direct negotiation with China.—The project of sending a commission of inquiry to the Gran Chaco in the Bolivian-Paraguay dispute was deferred by the Council; while it also reaffirmed its stand towards Peru in the Leticia dispute.—Count Albert Apponyi, Hungary's "grand old man" and dean of delegates to the League of Nations, died at Geneva on February 7. His funeral took place on February 9 at St. Joseph's Church, in Geneva.

War Debts.—As Sir Ronald Lindsay was conferring

daily with a Cabinet Committee in London, speculation was rife as to who might be appointed as "debt ambassador" to the United States, Lord Reading being prominently suggested. In Parliament, answers to questions indicated that the proposed World Economic Conference would have to wait indefinitely until there were positive results from the forthcoming debt conference in Washington. Reports were current that Sir Ronald was bringing with him a plan for a "lump-sum" payment. At the same time Mr. Roosevelt was reported as planning to keep Congress informed of his debt actions through a small liaison group to be arranged for, thus calming the fears of Senators Lewis and Reed. He was also said to be communicating directly with Premier MacDonald.

On February 5, Viscount Snowden of Ickornshaw, former Chancellor of the Exchequer, issued through the press a statement tending to neutralize the effect of Neville Chamberlain's blunt refusals to consider any "swapping." Said the statement: "America's condition for revision of the debts, that she should be given some compensation for the sacrifice of her claims, is not unreasonable." Moreover: "To make a bilateral tariff agreement with the United States would be in harmony with the claims which British statesmen are shouting from the rooftops." Still further:

The contention that any agreement with the United States for greater freedom of trade between the two countries must await the World Economic Conference is without substance. . . . Two questions the Washington conference can settle: the debts question and the granting to the United States of compensation in the form of a freer access to British markets on a basis of fair competitive conditions. British comment on this utterance was favorable. On February 7, a report was made public of the International Chamber of Commerce, recommending a world conference to act upon the debts, together with a multitude of other allied topics, such as political disturbances and economic disharmonies, prices and international indebtedness, international ententes, special trade barriers, methods of tariff "demobilization," and the restoration of a stable monetary standard. From this recommendation it was plain that no one phase of the tangled situation could be discussed in isolation from the others.

Next week the Editor will present an article in which he will set forth some new aspects of birth control.

John LaFarge will write a human-interest piece called "Carpathia in Maryland."

Terence O'Donnell will offer a timely article on "The Moralities of Bankruptcy."

Francis Talbot will present some more evidence about the bad books of which he wrote last week.

Ruth Byrns will write a paper on "New-Type Tests."

The article of H. C. Watts on the end of the Oxford Movement, announced for this week, will appear next week.

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1933

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
GERARD B. DONNELLY

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN
Associate Editors

JOHN LAFARGE
JAMES F. DONOVAN

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: MEdallion 3-3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Our New President

ALTHOUGH the great event drew little attention, on Wednesday, February 8, Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, and John N. Garner, of Texas, were chosen to be President and Vice-President of the United States. The Constitution provides that the Presidential electors shall meet in their respective States, at a time fixed by Congress, to cast their votes. By statute Congress has fixed the time as the first Wednesday in January. The ballots are then sent to Washington, and on the second Wednesday in February, a time also fixed by statute, they are counted by the President of the Senate, in the presence of both Houses. The result is entered on the journals of Congress, and the ballots are then buried in the archives of the State Department.

In a sense, Mr. Roosevelt won his election more easily than did Washington, although the first President had no opponent. On July 2, 1788, Congress was officially notified that the ninth State, New Hampshire, had ratified the Constitution. By resolution of September 13, Congress declared the Constitution in effect, and fixed the first Wednesday in January, 1789, as the day for choosing the Presidential electors, the first Wednesday in February for the casting and counting of their ballots, and the first Wednesday in March, which in 1789 was March 4, for the beginning of the new Government. This clock-like arrangement, however, did not prevail. North Carolina and Rhode Island were still outside the Union, and while New York had ratified the Constitution, it was only by the turn of a few votes, and popular feeling was still so sore that the New York Assembly refused either to call an election or appoint electors. Hence Washington was elected by the votes of only ten of the thirteen States.

Congress was supposed to meet in New York, then the capital, on March 4, but a quorum did not appear until March 30. For a month after his election Washington was, technically, and also in fact, still a private citizen.

On April 6, Senator John Langdon, of New Hampshire, was elected President of the Senate for the purpose of opening the ballots, and certifying the election. Vice-President-elect John Adams arrived in New York on April 21. On April 16, Washington left Mount Vernon "with a mind oppressed with more anxious and painful thoughts than I have words to express," but "with the best disposition to render service to my country, in obedience to its call." On April 30, 1789, he was inaugurated in the old City Hall, on the site now occupied by the Sub-Treasury building on Wall Street.

Mr. Roosevelt is expected to name his Cabinet on March 4, but in the absence of necessary legislation, Washington could not name his until September. His Secretary of State was Jefferson, while Hamilton took the Treasury, Henry Knox the War Department, and Edmund Randolph, the Attorney-Generalship. Samuel Osgood was the Postmaster-General. Washington had no idea of forming a "Cabinet," a term unknown to the Constitution, but expected to consult, rather, the Senate. But so much friction resulted that two trials were enough, and thereafter, like Topsy, the Cabinet "just grew."

The incoming President will face issues hardly less grave than those which confronted Washington. But he had the approval of the country last November, and his fellow-citizens are no less anxious than he that the Administration prove in every way a blessing to the country. Catholics should not fail to commend him and our country to God in their prayers.

Catholic Social Science

THAT very useful organization, the National Catholic Alumni Federation, has issued two booklets. One is a report of the Regional Conferences on Social Justice held at Fordham University, the Catholic University, Notre Dame University, and St. Mary's College, Oakland, California, in November, 1932. The second suggests plans for alumni study and discussion clubs.

At all these Conferences, the chief topics suggested by the Encyclicals, "Rerum Novarum" and "Quadragesimo Anno," were discussed and an effort was made to apply the principles of these documents to the grave conditions in which we are now living. It was realized from the outset, however, that not much could be accomplished by a small group of scholars sitting at a table, discussing policies and plans with fair unanimity, and then departing for their respective homes. The first purpose of the Conference was to make the principles of social justice known to Catholics as a body. The pamphlets issued by the Federation are to be taken as one step toward the attainment of that purpose.

One wonders why something of the kind was not done years ago. It was the desire of Leo XIII that his Encyclical on the Condition of the Working Classes be explained to the people in sermons, lectures, conferences, and by other appropriate means, but that desire was not met in any notable manner. For many years the Encyclical was considered a handy arsenal of facts and principles, to be hurled against Socialists, but that was

almost its sole use. Here and there an apologist, or a scholar like Dr. John A. Ryan, tried to make us understand what the Encyclical really meant, while *AMERICA*, the *Catholic World*, and other publications illustrated the purpose of the Encyclical by applying it to current instances. On the whole, however, the laity remained in ignorance.

Perhaps that was the difficulty. The clergy knew the Encyclicals, and a few of the educated laity, but most of that generation grew up in utter ignorance of the very existence of an adequate, authoritative discussion of the complex problems of capital and labor, written by a Pope. The new campaign aims to take the two Encyclicals to the layman, and proposes to make a beginning with the college man. The plan merits success, and will probably attain it.

The Red Motor Car

FOR some years the automobile industry of the country has been in straits. Its difficulties are not wholly attributable to the economic depression, bad as that has been. The industry began in a small blacksmith shop, and within a few years grew to rank with the largest industries in the country. So speedy was its growth, in response to an insistent demand from the public, that problems were solved as they came up, without much foresight or scientific planning.

To this statement, there are important exceptions. The manufacturers called in the country's best engineers, and soon had the major technical problems of construction well in hand. But equally important problems, such as distribution, were set aside. The public wanted machines, and seemed able to pay for them; hence why worry? But the worry came when in the first part of the last decade, dozens of firms were faced with the alternative of mergers on dictated terms, or bankruptcy.

But an even more important question, that of labor, had also been referred to the future for proper adjustment. Many of the factories paid decent, and even good wages, but some did not. In many, perhaps in most, provision was made for the physical welfare of the worker in well-lighted and properly ventilated quarters, provided with all necessary safety devices. In others, all these provisions were neglected. But in all, with a few happy exceptions, labor was regarded as a commodity, to be bought in the most favorable market, just as the purchasing agents bought steel, timber, transportation, and fuel.

Occasional clashes, inevitable in an industry of this magnitude, should have warned the manufacturers. The workers began to resent the paternalism which demanded proof that its workers led temperate lives outside the factory, and sought this proof through spies, and through agents who went into their homes to inspect and report. What might otherwise have seemed a kindly benevolence was resented as invasion. The owners were not actuated by kindness, said the workers. The owners took care of them just as they took care of their machines, and for exactly the same reason. This belief became settled when the workers found that for one reason or another,

they were not allowed to organize to protect themselves as they, and not their employers, deemed best.

The inevitable followed. When some five or six years ago the country began to see a red Bolshevik lurking in every corner, this Review pointed out that the best way capital had of defeating the Bolsheviks wherever they might be was by defending the rights of labor. Whatever may be said of the power of Moscow to stir up industrial war in this country, there can be no doubt that every employer of labor who violates the rights of his employees works hand in glove with the most powerful factions of revolt. Deny men their natural right to organize for the protection of their interests by lawful means, and the next step is the organization of groups to further selfish interests by violence. The proof of that assertion is the history of labor and capital in this country for the last hundred years. This Review pleaded for recognition of the labor union in the textile industry, and in the coal fields of West Virginia and Kentucky. That recognition was withheld, and when the peaceful union was rejected by the operators, the destruction of property and the destruction of human life soon followed.

It is now reported, on what appears to be good authority, that the Communistic elements have at last bored into the automobile industry. That statement, if true, should cause no surprise. If not true at the present moment, it will be true shortly. The industry has never been friendly to the labor-union idea, and has steadfastly and successfully resisted organization by its employees. With all allowance made for the occasional exceptions, it has never been able to go beyond the factitious recognition implied in a company union. And that policy is fatal.

The Governors' Meeting

WRITING as a private citizen, Franklin D. Roosevelt has invited the Governors of the States to meet him at the White House on March 6. The conference will indeed be "informal," as Mr. Roosevelt styles it, for it would be difficult to understand how results of importance could be reached in the one day specifically assigned as the duration of the meeting.

Of the value of such meetings in themselves, there is not much doubt. Government today is a far more complex than it was in 1789 or even in 1929. There are many activities in which the States and the Federal Government can and should cooperate, for the common welfare. There are also many which the Federal Government should never have undertaken, and which it should turn back to the States as soon as possible. Possibly Mr. Roosevelt has some of these in mind when he refers to "other subjects" proper for discussion.

It is understood, of course, that such meetings have no official standing of any kind. Nor are they likely to discover any hitherto unsuspected authority residing either in the Federal Government, or in the States. They might, however, stimulate the States to use powers which only a few call upon; that of making treaties and agreements, for instance with the permission of Congress. Treaties between contiguous States on a subject of common in-

terest, such as the regulation of inter-State motor-bus rates, would not only avoid the need of Federal legislation, and inevitable litigation, but would achieve the reform desired, effectively and speedily. That is another topic the Governors might discuss with the President.

Is Congress Corrupt?

THAT the Senate has not lost its power to move swiftly is demonstrated by the case of David S. Barry, and his article in the *New Outlook*. Mr. Barry had written that while, contrary to public belief, "there are not many crooks in Congress," there are demagogues in both Houses who vote for legislation simply because they believe that this will help their political or social fortunes. For a time it seemed that Mr. Barry might be permitted to resign his position as sergeant-at-arms of the Senate, but in the end an outraged Senate reached for the axe, and Mr. Barry was decapitated.

Possibly Mr. Barry's official position and the directness of his accusations explain this unwonted speed. The Senate can hardly be ignorant of the fact that what Mr. Barry wrote lacks little of being a common belief. So common indeed is this opinion that the members of a reputable editorial board, Alfred E. Smith among them, felt no particular hesitancy in admitting it to the pages of their magazine. Other editors have said as much, and, despite the Barry incident, will say it again, with additions.

Even during the hearings, the New York *Herald Tribune* stated in an editorial comment that although the precise charge made by Mr. Barry was "unfounded in fact," on the whole, he "let the Senate off much too easily." Taking the veterans' compensation bill as a text, the *Herald Tribune* proceeded to read the Senate a lesson. The normal briber, wrote the editor, generally uses his own money when he wishes to favor his business by unfair legislation. But in voting money for men who never smelt gunpowder, and for "their sisters and their aunts and their cousins," as well, the Senate had the effrontery to use the money that belonged to their fellow-citizens "whom they are supposed to represent and protect." The editor concluded with the reflection that Mr. Barry's article was wrong in two important respects. It misstated the facts, and understated the truth.

The country will probably forget the whole incident in a few weeks, and then go on believing that Mr. Barry was right. He may have slipped up, John Smith will say, in choosing the wrong incident for the basis of his attack, but time has familiarized us with the politician who is always ready to vote for the grand old flag and a larger appropriation to turn Salt Creek, if it is in his district, into a canal for ocean liners. Viewing the mass of the so-called "social legislation" and "fifty-fifty" bills enacted during the last two decades, can Congress reply with assurance of its innocence?

To say that the number of Congressmen who sell their votes for money is small, as Mr. Barry claims, or somewhat larger, as is improbable, does not state the real issue. In these subtle days, who pays cash for votes? The real issue lies deeper. Has the House of Represen-

tatives become so large, as many think, that it can no longer be truly representative? Senator Tydings recently pointed out that the House has been known to pass a billion-dollar appropriation bill, after one hour of debate, the said hour to be divided, theoretically, among 435 members. Has the business of the country become so extensive and complex that ninety-six Senators, even though they toil in their offices until the midnight hour, are quite unable to cope with it? At present, practically all business in the House, the body in which the amount of money to be demanded from the citizen is voted, is controlled by small committees. In the Senate, a much smaller body, with its rule of unlimited debate, a small group of men, or even one man, may block all business, until special demands are satisfied.

But decapitation of a third, or even a half, of our Representatives would not constitute a remedy. It is more important to improve the quality than to decrease the quantity. We need more men in Congress who understand that their oath to support the Constitution means that they must put aside all thoughts of social, financial, and political profit, and with an austerity no less impartial than that of the bench, initiate and promote those laws only which are in accord with the spirit and purpose of the Constitution. Nothing less than this will remove the basis for just criticism, or make Congress an object of respect instead of, what it now is, a butt for rude banter.

A Formula for Fame

IN an interview in the New York *Times*, Dr. Sigmund Spaeth, whose doctorate in philosophy was won by his researches in music, gives the formula for writing the words of a popular song. First, put yourself in the position of a person whose intelligence is below the average. That done, equip yourself with a less-than-average vocabulary, and the range of thought, experience, and sense for grammar, which the less-than-average person would possess. If you can encompass a rhyme like Ira Gershwin's

I'm bidin' my time,
That's the kind of guy I'm

you may make your fortune.

Dr. Spaeth should not restrict his formula to song writing, for it has also been used with conspicuous success in the manufacture of popular fiction. Many a hungry novelist has risen to fame and fortune, carrying a decrepit publishing house with him, by conscientiously applying it for some 300 pages. Nor is it unknown in journalism, history, or science. Arthur Brisbane, "ol' Doc Brisbane," as the *Journal of the American Medical Association* has brevetted him for his remarkable contributions to medical science, has used no other for years.

When we have historians like Wells, philosophers like Durant and Dorsey, along with such poets as Gershwin and Guest, it is easy to see that Dr. Spaeth's formula is both profitable and useful. By following it, Mr. Gershwin has done in two lines what Shakespeare never did, and, probably, could not do.

Shall We Recognize Russia?

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

A SENSE of duty impels me to write these few lines; for the lady in charge of the barter exchange, after she had explained to me the mysteries of scrip, impressed upon me in deadly earnest that every socially minded person was *bound* to ask himself the question: "Shall we recognize Russia?" and that the test of his social-mindedness would lie in his answer. At his last visit to this country, the Moscow correspondent of the *New York Times* applied a similar test to our honored President-elect, being said to have visited the latter for a day at Hyde Park-on-the-Hudson, wherefore the correspondent was rewarded with a characteristically patient hearing and a smile. The testing process bids fair to be resumed after March 4, being already begun by 800 college professors, representing 268 colleges in forty-five States, who have already petitioned Mr. Roosevelt to act for recognition. Non-recognition, in their view, is "one of the most serious hazards to peace in the present critical world situation."

Now the good Lord knows that I want peace; and so do we all. Anything that *will* bring peace to the world is beyond all price. And if 800 college professors say that recognition, or any other course of action, will bring peace, what am I, who am not even one eight-hundredth of a college professor, to gainsay them? The case would appear to be settled, motion carried and the ayes have it, if it were not for the remembrance that hardly more than a handful of fleeting months have elapsed since in August, 1929, some hundred or more experts, representing not only a vast array of schools and professorships of political economy, but numberless governments, trade organizations, banks, exchanges, chambers of commerce, State Departments, and research foundations, sat around the table at The Hague and helped the delegates to decide that a system of scheduled annuities, to be paid into an international bank, would be a "final" settlement of the debts and reparations problem, and, consequently, of the financial unrest of the world. Events following in short order showed that they were completely and epochally wrong. Not ignorance, but neglect of the simple and the obvious deceived them.

The simple and the obvious, not any recondite reasoning, makes the ordinary citizen question the wisdom of the 800 professors. The policy that our Government has been following, ever since the destruction of the first Russian revolution and the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks, is not, as had been repeatedly explained, based upon any mere "difference of governmental system." It is not because we have a democratic, representative form of Government, and the Russians are under a system of soviets, or of planned control, or whatever it may be, that we are obliged to maintain towards them the attitude of the Jews toward the Samaritans.

Two conditions for recognition of a foreign country have been our traditional policy. The first of these con-

ditions, that the nation to be recognized should enjoy a stable form of government, may be considered as verified in the Soviet instance. But the presence of the other condition, that the nation should be in a position to fulfil its international obligations, still remains, in Russia's case, to be proved. For, as was stated by Secretary Stimson on December 6, 1930, our Government cannot extend such recognition until the Soviet Government "ceases agitating for the overthrow by force of the United States Government."

Immediately, as from the combined throats of 800 college professors, I hear the cry arise: "WHY do you say that the Soviet Government is agitating for the overthrow by force of the United States Government? The Soviet Union is doing no such thing. It is peacefully attending to the task of Russia's reconstruction, and of laying the foundation of a new social order? Didn't the Pope himself recommend some such thing?"

The answer to that exclamation is that were the Union of Federated Socialist Soviet Republics engaged just in that sort of thing; *were* the gentleman across the street occupied with naught but hoeing his garden and figuring out a new manner of life for his own delight, we might be cautious about inviting him to tea, but we could still recognize him as a neighbor. But it is the also, the overplus, that makes the trouble, and the overplus in this instance is the Third International.

The oceans of literature that have poured forth concerning Soviet Russia during the past fifteen years have failed to invalidate either one of the two propositions: that the Soviet Government is practically identified with the Third International of the Communist Party, and that this same party is irrevocably committed to the destruction, through class warfare, of all existing forms of government. Until this uncertainty can be definitely cleared up, by the complete and definite rejection of subservience to the party by the Soviet Government, recognition of "Russia" means simply the recognition of an organized movement to do away with our established institutions.

A few observations may help to clear up some of the preceding statements. Just what this identification of the party and the Government means, was stated bluntly by Mr. Duranty, as authentic an exponent as exists of Soviet opinion, in the *New York Times* of January 6 of this year. He is speaking of the organization of a transportation conference "not by the railroad commissariat or any governmental organization but by the Central Committee of the Communist party," and the comparatively slight importance laid by the Moscow press upon the action of the Governmental assembly itself (*italics mine*):

It may have seemed to some readers of yesterday's dispatch from this correspondent that the status of the Soviet Government was unduly minimized in comparison with the Communist party.

Perhaps this was the case, for, after all, the Soviet Government is the supreme authority of the Soviet Union in its relations with other countries. Nevertheless, it is a fact that the Communist party, which rules the Soviet Union, regards the Central Committee as the real governing authority of the country. . . .

Indeed, it may be said that all commissars "rank" according to their party standing and not, as in the West, by the importance of the posts they hold. *To put it bluntly, the party is "the whole works" and the government is the method or mechanism through and by which the party will be expressed and executed.*

On a previous occasion the same correspondent stigmatized the obtuseness of those who clung to the outworn idea that there was any real separation between the party and the Government, whatever the Government might choose to say. The words quoted above coincide with those of Lenin in his draft of a monograph on the dictatorship of the proletariat, planned in 1920 (quoted by W. Gurian in "Bolshevism," page 300): "The State is simply the weapon with which the proletariat wages its class war. *A special sort of bludgeon, nothing more.*"

In matters of international law, with which recognition is concerned, a State is presumed to abide by its written constitution, unless the same has been formally abrogated. The constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, U. S. S. R., adopted in December, 1923, states in its opening words that: "Since the formation of the Soviet Republics, the world has become divided into two camps, that of capitalism and that of Socialism. . . . The very structure of the Soviet power, which is international in its class character, calls the toiling masses of the Soviet Republics toward a unity of one socialist family." The Soviet States form "a decisive step towards the *union of the toilers of all countries into one World Soviet Socialist Republic.*" Hence the Soviet governmental system is to be spread to the whole world, a task to which of their nature they are irrevocably committed.

That the Communist objective is hushed up for sympathetic visitors to Moscow does not alter the situation, any more than the fact that the Soviet Government is, momentarily, too much occupied with its own problem and too anxious about foreign credit to care to give much utterance to these views. They nevertheless remain unrepudiated, and from time to time are quietly, but emphatically reasserted. For its New Year's message, the Moscow *Pravda*, official organ of the Communist party, on January 1 of this year, informs the world (italics theirs):

The hungry proletariats in capitalistic countries call to the ruined poor and middle peasants. On the basis of their daily struggle for a beggarly existence, the toilers in capitalistic countries are convinced that there is *but one way out of the crisis—a revolutionary dethronement of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat*; that the process of destruction of the productive forms of capitalism can be halted *only by the Socialist revolution.*

These words are published with full knowledge of their effect upon world opinion; and their meaning for the revolutionary elements in the different countries. It is precisely this "process of radicalization of the masses," to use the continuing language of the editorial, which "is advancing with equal pace in every country," that the

party is pledged to facilitate, until the masses reach the "third stage of psychology," which is designated, quoting Lenin (their own capitalization), as "*hatred for capitalism and not only in general, but for ONE'S OWN (svoyemu) government and bourgeoisie.*"

From the above simple facts, and from recent events in Russia, two or three equally simple corollaries may be deduced.

The recognition of the Soviet Government is necessarily the recognition of the "whole works," which is an international organization created and conducted for the express purpose, according to its latest pronouncement, of "radicalizing the masses" and instilling hatred for "one's own" Government. One of the objectives of this same Government, as declared by the Associated Press dispatch from Moscow of December 29, 1932, is the "ultimate abolition of the home as the unit of family life."

We would recognize not the Russian people, but the armed forces, by which that people is held in rigid bondage, as a source of supply for the army's money, food, and clothing. It is the recognition not of a nation, but of an army, with which the nation itself is helplessly, but bitterly at war. The nation itself is caught in what the Socialist Harold Laski calls "The grim logic of Leninism—the dictatorship of the proletariat, the drastic suppression of counter-revolution, the confiscation of the essential element of production," etc.

The same "logic," according to Eugene Lyons, of the United Press, has produced "about 7,000 strategic points" to be formed under the Kremlin to enforce official policies upon the peasants, who have refused to "like" the collective farms, "and to destroy hostile elements."

Our grounds for the non-recognition of Russia are not based upon the fact of the religious persecution; although only an irreligious State could be expected to adopt a policy of attack against the world. Nevertheless, with this point clearly understood, as Christians and as Catholics we are confronted by the problem of associating on friendly terms with an organization which explicitly, as a basic condition of its existence and of all its activity, is pledged to destroy that Divine Faith which we not only hold sacred, but recognize as the only basis on which society can be restored. We are not pledged to a capitalistic society. We are not unable to recognize a government which conducts an experiment in governmental control. That we can legitimately say is "their affair," which we can "study" and profit by, as a good or a bad example. But we cannot grasp a hand that is pledged to destroy us.

Can we separate the "business advantages" of recognition from the threats to our national and social life? Perhaps in theory, but the present crisis has proved by its appalling record that this is just what cannot be done. Business is prostrate because of moral and social, not of merely monetary factors. Twist and turn the matter as we may, we have still the same irreducible problem: the Third International as the opponent of all constructive human effort.

The Testimony of Bernadette

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

IT was my intention this week to tell the story of the apparitions at Lourdes to Bernadette Soubirous, at some length. I may be permitted to do that at some other time. For reasons which I think are good, it seems preferable to give at this time merely a summary, followed by an examination of the testimony.

Last week we left Bernadette, with her sister, "Toinette-Marie, and their cousin, Jeanne Abadie, on their way to the field of M. La Fitte. But Bernadette is not quite easy; perhaps "La Pigouno" has assured them without authority that M. La Fitte is willing for them to pick up sticks there. She proposes a diversion: "Let's go down and see where the canal ends." Off they put for the tongue of land where the canal empties into the Gave. Opposite this point, at the foot of a steep mass of rock known as Massabielle, is a shallow cave, or grotto, shaped something like a dome; and at the upper right-hand side is an opening which lets in a little light.

Looking across the canal, they see a pile of driftwood, and also some bones. Jeanne and "Toinette-Marie take off their sabots to ford the shallow canal, but Bernadette hesitates. The water is very cold, and a fresh attack of asthma may be induced by getting her feet wet. Since "Toinette-Marie is too little to carry her over, and Jeanne Abadie refuses (with a swear word, I regret to say, for which Bernadette energetically reproves her), Bernadette does not quite know what to do. By throwing stones into the canal, she tries to make a dry-shod passage for herself. But it is hopeless, and finally she sits down to take off her stockings, and go across bare-foot to join the others.

The first stocking is off, when to her surprise, she hears a sound as of a mighty wind, although the trees are not stirred. She looks over to the grotto, and there sees "a Lady in white." At first she rubs her eyes, thinking it a delusion, but the vision persists. Falling on her knees, she takes out her rosary, but she is unable to lift her hand to make the Sign of the Cross. Not until the Lady takes the rosary which she carries on her arm, and makes the Sign of the Cross, can Bernadette move. The beads slip through the Lady's fingers, but she does not speak, until they come to the "Gloria Patri," and that they say together. The day was Thursday, February 11, 1858.

Bernadette did not know who the Lady was. She thought at first that it was a spirit, but a good spirit, for when the child sprinkled her with holy water at the next apparition, the Lady smiled sweetly and bowed her head with devotion. She was not to know her name for some weeks, nor was she inclined to talk about it. But the story got out on the second day, and the police took fright; and by police I mean the gold lace and tricolored sashes and cocked hats, and all the rest of the folderol punctiliously affected by petty officials in small places. In spite of threats and even rough usage, Bernadette re-

turned every day to the grotto, and on eighteen occasions in all, the last on July 16, the Lady appeared to her. At the third apparition, on Thursday, February 18, the Lady asked Bernadette to come every day for fifteen days. "I do not promise you happiness in this world," she said, "but in the other." On twelve occasions, the Lady spoke to her. What did she say?

While some were extraordinary, most of the messages were simple requests for the revival of ordinary Christian practices. She asked the child to pray for sinners, and to bid the people pray for them, and to do penance. She commanded Bernadette to wash in the spring, the existence of which had been unknown, and to drink of it, and to tell the priests to build a chapel there, and to come with the people in procession. On Thursday, March 25, the Feast of the Annunciation, in obedience to the command of Abbé Peyramale, the child begged to know the Lady's name. At last the Lady bowed her glorious head, and in a voice that trembled spoke these words in the patois of the hills.

QUÉ SOY ÉRA IMMACULADA COUNCEPTIOU

I AM THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

The child had never heard the words applied to Our Blessed Lady, and did not know what they meant. But stern old Abbé Peyramale, that giant of a man in physique as well as faith, did, and although he made no comment, they conquered him.

Bernadette faithfully carried out the orders of the Lady whom at last she knew, for the words had been explained to her, to be the Blessed Virgin. Her welcome on this earth was that usually reserved for the Saints, but the result is Lourdes, a place where Christians come from all over the world to find Jesus through Mary, and where some find Him who come only to scoff.

Is it all founded on a lie, or at least on a delusion? It is our contention that by her life and by her words Bernadette shows herself to be a witness to whom full credence is to be given.

A witness is one who states truthfully what he sees, or has seen, or what he knows. Two elements are involved which must be assessed before he can be accepted as a credible witness. The first is his mental condition, prior to and at the time of the events to which he speaks, and now. The second is his reputation for truthfulness and general probity.

Should a friend tell me that this morning he saw a rhinoceros with legs thirty yards in diameter, emerge from Altman's, and climb up the outside of the Empire State Building, like a fly, to the very tip of the flag pole, where he balanced himself on the tip of his horn, I should probably think it would be dangerous not to humor him. I should reflect, of course, that the straitness of Fifth Avenue and Thirty-fourth Street tinged the story with a certain improbability, but I should not urge this view. If my friend insisted that I swallow the tale, I should

look about for a policeman (or a physician's office) and chatting merrily on the odd habits of the rhinoceros, gently ease him into the hands of the policeman or the medical man. Were he known to me as a witty wag, with a penchant for proposing puns and humorous situations, like my colleague, Father Talbot, I should wait for some one else to ask the first question.

But suppose that, instead of talking about scaling rhinoceri, my friend were to begin with a story about a man who had visions and cured the sick. You and I would probably say, "I don't believe the story. I think you are probably mistaken. But where is the evidence? What are the undoubted facts in the case? Who is the witness?" This is only saying that in the face of a new alleged fact, you and I have recourse to such powers as the good God has given us, before we assent.

Let us apply the test to Bernadette. By the testimony of all who knew her, and lived with her both at Lourdes and after she had left Lourdes, her character for truthfulness is above reproach. It might indeed be said of her, as of William George Ward, that she was grotesquely truthful. To be frank, however, her truthfulness has never been seriously questioned.

But may she not have yielded to suggestion?

Suggestion from whom? When Bernadette came home and reluctantly told the story of the first apparition, all the applause and encouragement she got from her mother was a box on the ear. ("Toinette-Marie got one too.") After the second apparition, Mère Soubirous proposed to thrash her with a stick; a thick one too, for the poor woman was angry to think that her truthful Bernadette was beginning to tell lies. "Are you at last going to misbehave?" said her father, reproachfully. Evidently, no suggestion came from her family.

From the priests? The clergy, with their wonted attitude the world over in similar circumstances, held aloof. As for the pastor, Abbé Peyramale, Bernadette confessed that she was as afraid of him as she was of a gendarme, and she had never spoken to him. The curates did not even know her. Pointed out to one of them a month after the first apparition, he recalled her only as the oldest and most stupid pupil in his catechism class. (She was not stupid; she simply did not know French. The stupid one was the teacher who tried to instruct the child in a language she did not know.) When Bernadette at last screwed up her courage, and carried to the pastor the message of the beautiful Lady, she was received coldly. Or, rather, he boiled over and blew up. He showed her plainly—until the message of March 25—that he thought her either untruthful or deceived.

Finally, although interrogated again and again by obviously hostile officials, this humble peasant child, easily frightened by gold lace, always told a plain straight story, from which she did not detract, to which she did not add. She told the same story for the next twenty-one years. In the shadow of death, before the Bishop and her confessor, she repeated it. The evidential value of this testimony cannot be gainsaid. Bernadette was neither a liar, nor a weak follower of suggestion.

Was she the victim of an hallucination? This would excuse her from untruthfulness, but make her subject to delusion.

In view of the legal and medical examinations, of the keen scrutiny to which she was subjected from 1858 to her death in 1879, and of what is known of her before 1858, the theory of hallucination cannot possibly be sustained. Bernadette never exhibited even one of the usual signs of the deluded visionary. On the contrary, her intellectual and moral traits were those which are never found, persistently and consistently, in the visionary.

Except for asthma, her health was fair until a few years before her death. As for "nerves," this cheerful, normal child, who grew into a pleasant, courteous, useful young woman, seemed to have none. Next, the visionary invariably courts publicity, if not in the market place, in his own circle. Bernadette did everything in her power to divert attention from herself. She never saw Lourdes in its great days, since in 1866 she had entered the convent at Nevers. The visionary is always anxious to impress his company with his importance; like the Ancient Mariner, he forces his story upon you. Bernadette never spoke of the apparitions, except in reply to those who had a right to interrogate her. The visionary, as a rule, conceives vaguely, and speaks wildly; not uncommonly the trend of his suggestions is unwholesome. Bernadette could describe exactly what she saw; she spoke concisely and to the point; and the trend of all that she said was sweet and wholesome, inducing her hearers to love Our Lord and His Mother, and to practise virtue. Finally, in the victim of hallucination, the disorder runs a fairly regular course. There is a return to mental health, followed by retraction, or complete oblivion of the marvelous incidents; or there is a gradual decline, ending in moral decay, or marked mental instability. I think that every priest who has been obliged to deal with these cases, will agree with this description.

Not one of these symptoms is observable in Bernadette. The day of the first apparition marked the beginning of a steady progress both intellectually, and in the order of grace. She began to go to school regularly, and she made her First Holy Communion on June 3. After two years she became a very contented working girl who peeled potatoes, swept floors, and washed windows, in the school where she had been a pupil. If sanity be defined as ready and proper adaptation to environment, Bernadette was one of the sanest persons who ever lived. Always calm and balanced, cheerful, hard-working, and happy, throughout the rest of her life, spent at Nevers as infirmarian and as sacristan, Bernadette was a model of saintly common sense.

Obviously, Bernadette's story has nothing in common with that of the visionary who, unless carefully guarded by family or friends, ends in the public madhouse, or the police courts.

Finally, those who adopt the supposition that Bernadette was either untruthful or suffering from delusions, must sustain it by evidence that all who examined her were either unfit for the task, because of credulity or want

of scientific training, or that they deliberately chose to defend a lie or a delusion. In the space at my disposal (and the Editor is generous) I cannot discuss this at length. But I can appeal to the facts; they are of record; and demand evidence that the examiners were ignoramuses or rascals. There is no such evidence, but abundant evidence to the contrary.

Bishop Laurence, the Ordinary of Tarbes, to whom the case was referred, was a man of cold and reserved temperament; "by nature," writes one who knew him well, "unemotional, deliberate, and practical." A child of the poor, he had come forth from the battle with want, a strong character, loving truth and justice. If his critics had anything against him, it was that when important matters had to be examined, his analytical mind was wont to sift reason after reason, heedless of any apparent necessity for immediate action. "What!" exclaimed his neighbor, the Bishop of Montpellier, in 1860, "Two years, and the Bishop of Tarbes not satisfied yet?" The Bishop of Tarbes was not. He had appointed a Commission on July 28, 1858, ordering it to call to its assistance "men skilled in the sciences of medicine, physics, chemistry, geology, etc., and to neglect no means whatever of arriving at the truth whatever it might be." By this Commission, pledged in the Name of the All-seeing God, to search diligently for the truth, Bernadette, with everyone who had known her, and all the circumstances of the apparitions, were examined. But it was not until January 18, 1862, when the Commission had sat for three and one-half years, that Bishop Laurence reached his decision, which he thus expressed:

We declare that Mary, the Immaculate Mother of God, did in reality appear to Bernadette Soubirous on February 11, 1858, and on certain subsequent occasions to the number of eighteen in all, in the Grotto of Massabielle, near the town of Lourdes; that this Apparition bears every mark of truth, and that the Faithful are justified in believing it certain.

I am quite aware that my summation is indeed weak. The evidence, however, can be studied in a mass of printed material, and the sources are still open to all who wish to make a detailed and independent examination.

But if all this is true, it may be asked, why does not Lourdes convert the world? I might counter by asking why Calvary did not. If you hold this against Lourdes, how can you explain the soldiers throwing dice at the very foot of the Cross and the crowds that blasphemed Him? But I can also offer this.

Unfortunately, some, even among those who mean to be Christians, are prepared to assert that the God Who made Himself known to His people in the loving kindness of the Promised Land as well as in the thunders of Sinai, is no longer able to communicate Himself to the followers of His Son. To all these, I fear, Lourdes is and will continue to be (in the absence of an illuminating grace) a stumbling block and an offense, as the Cross of Christ was to some of the Jews and Gentiles to whom St. Paul preached. I would point out that faith is a free gift communicated by God to whomsoever He wishes. It belongs to us, indeed, to prepare ourselves for the reception of this gift, but nothing that we can do can

place Almighty God under an obligation to give it, as a wage for work, as a reward for merit. Further, while it is forbidden for us to judge particular cases, we know that God can bestow the gift and see it rejected.

But some still believe with St. Paul, in Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever, and recall with a sweetness that is not of earth the gracious days when His sacred Feet hallowed the hot highways of Judea in search of the wandering sheep. These find no difficulty in also believing that God can still communicate Himself to us in a visible manner. Once the possibility is admitted, the fact too can be admitted; and when evidence is given, must be, on pain of intellectual apostasy.

Whether He Himself comes, or sends an archangel, or His most holy Mother, the purpose of the visitation is always the same. It is the purpose which brought Him from Heaven to Bethlehem and Nazareth, and to the Jordan when John was baptizing. It is the purpose which sustained Him as in weariness He went about consoling the broken-hearted, healing the sick, bringing back the dead from the corruption of the grave, preaching to all the good news of man's salvation. It is the same Divine purpose that drew Him to Calvary, where He preached most eloquently from the shame and suffering of the Cross. Everywhere and always that purpose is to teach a weary sinful world the tenderness as well as the justice of God, and to draw all men without exception to the healing which He offers them.

The story of the apparitions of the loving Mother of God to Bernadette at Lourdes is an open book. Like Lourdes itself, nothing is hidden. The whole world is invited to come, to look, to examine, to use all that the mind of man can devise to search out whether this thing be of God or not. There are no sealed chapters here, no hidden nooks; all is as open as the Grotto under Massabielle, as plain to view as the sparkling waters of the Gave that tumble and foam at its base. It is the story of a simple God-fearing child, whose life brought disquiet to none, but joy to all who knew her. To this illiterate little peasant maid, God sends a messenger, not as of old when He Himself spoke words of woe to the child Samuel, but His own Mother, smiling, loving, and ever fair, the gate of Heaven, and the cause of our joy. The messages which she confides to Bernadette are examined, and Bernadette, her mission ended, retires first to the convent school in Lourdes, and then to the novitiate at Nevers, where on April 16, 1879, her brief life ends. "My God, I love You with my whole heart, with my whole heart, with my whole heart," were almost her last words.

If there is anything of worth in human testimony, are these the words of a liar, or of a deluded visionary?

An instant or two later, she murmured that prayer which has comforted Saint and sinner alike through long ages of Christianity. "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners"—and then breaking off—"for me a poor sinner . . . a poor sinner." They were her last words. It was fifteen minutes past three o'clock on the afternoon of Wednesday, April 16, 1879, when she whose earthly

eyes had gazed upon Our Lady in the grotto under Massabielle, looked upon her again in the Courts of God.

The rest of her story, although it does not belong to this paper, may be briefly told. On August 20, 1908, the official inquiry into her life and virtues was begun at Nevers. After 133 sessions, the Cause went to Rome, in October, 1909, and on August 12, 1913, Pius X conferred upon her the title of Venerable Servant of God. On September 17, 1918, the ecclesiastical tribunal of Nevers began the proceedings for her beatification. After a searching examination, lasting through 203 sessions, the *Acta* were forwarded to Rome, and on June 14, 1925, Pius XI solemnly approved the Decree of her Beatification. The following is the prayer appointed for the Mass.

O God, Protector and Lover of the humble, Who didst cheer Thy servant Mary Bernard with the sight and conversation of the Immaculate Virgin Mary, grant, we beseech Thee, that by the simple way of faith we may become worthy to see Thee in Heaven. Through Our Lord, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with Thee, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. Amen.

Thirty years after Blessed Bernadette's death, the body was exhumed and found to be in a perfect state of preservation. On April 18, 1925, it was again exhumed, and found perfectly intact, with no trace of corruption. The Cause for her Canonization is pending at Rome. All clients of Our Blessed Lady will pray that this year of jubilee will see the messenger of Lourdes, "the little girl in the alley," raised to the full honors of the altar.

The Failure of a Bicentennial at Washington

THOMAS M. SCHWERTNER, O.P.

IT would almost seem as if there were some powerful conspiracy in operation to keep the country from knowing just what happened during last year's Washington Bicentennial in the capital city of the land. The celebration was advertised far and wide in hotels, trains, railroad stations, at cross roads, and especially in schools. One almost began to believe that there was to be a gigantic march on the city of Washington to keep high festival in honor of the Father of the Country.

Though every resident of Washington admits in private conversation, when he is not afraid to call his soul his own, that the Bicentennial was an egregious failure, the newspaper correspondents prowling about the quiet streets and jostling one another in the buzzing hotel lobbies consistently boosted every celebration for the benefit of their readers in every far-flung State in the Union.

But the truth of the matter is that, despite the elaborate preparations, the grant of Government subsidies, the support of men with magic names, the advertising stunts, the railroad ballyhoo intended to allure excursionists, the entire Washington Bicentennial celebration was a colossal fiasco. The decorations of the city at no time were general or distinguished; the parades were consistently insignificant (especially if you removed the high-school cadets, the Fort Meyer soldiers, and the employees of Government offices) and poorly managed; enthusiasm along the streets was noticeably absent: the influx of strangers was pitifully small, if you except the first day, as any hotel clerk or taxi driver will tell you; the show-window displays, featuring bicentennial subjects, were negligible. In no respect was the celebration worthy of the man whom it was intended to honor, nor creditable to the city bearing his name.

Now this apathy must not be laid at the door of the people of Washington, who do harbor a love for the man after whom the city is named because he literally created it out of a swamp and mud hole. The failure to honor Washington must be ascribed to the impression which got abroad, and in the early days was not contradicted, that this celebration was to be first, foremost, and exclusively,

a Masonic affair. It is difficult to say whether the Masons were responsible for this; but it is undeniable that they sought to impress the country that Washington was a Mason, and, to judge from the perfervid speeches delivered during the celebration and at the dedication of the Alexandria Monument, that he owed all his eminence and success to the fact that he was ensouled always with Masonic ideals and that he embodied in all he did Masonic ambitions.

While allowing for a certain dosage of Masonic enthusiasm and exaggeration—legitimate and graceful enough, inasmuch as the celebration was heralded as a distinctly Masonic affair and glorification—the fact remains that scarcely ever has there been given a more convincing demonstration of how far an organization will presume to go in order to advertise itself and to appropriate to itself credit for things which cannot be accounted for quite so simply. Hence it is easy to see how the general impression got abroad—and was not generally contradicted until the celebration proved itself a fiasco—that bodies not sympathetic to Masonic ideals were not expected or would not be welcomed to join in the festivities. It is true that this discrimination against the participation of certain organizations in the celebration was vehemently denied, not in the months of preparation or during the first weeks of the celebration, but only after it was plain that the whole affair would peter out pitifully unless some alien bodies would come to the rescue.

The reasons assigned for the mean success of the celebration explain nothing whatever. The depression will not explain the general lack of enthusiasm, for Washington visitors during the celebration were not much less numerous than in normal times. The Presidential campaign can only be made responsible by the wildest stretch of imagination, especially as the political leaders resident in the city were anxious to meet, handshake, and address knots of strangers, and, after it began to appear that the Democrats would sweep the country, to extend them unheard-of courtesies. The B. E. F. kept nobody away; while the veterans were in the city the curbstone partici-

pants in the celebration did not fall off. There is just one explanation: the Masons overshot themselves through too much ballyhoo, too patent a spirit of exclusivism, too arrogant an attitude of veiled hostility toward any but Masons having the right to join in honoring the Father of our Country.

One might have understood this attitude of the Masons if the celebration had been intended to mark Washington's entrance into the Alexandria lodge or his assumption of its leadership as Grand Master. But people generally felt that there was no reason for the Masons to monopolize the celebration as a distinctly and distinctively fraternal affair, seeing that his entrance into this world was being memorialized, and that it only remotely had any Masonic implications. This is the only explanation one can hear from Washingtonians who, better than the citizens of any other American city, by reason of their close proximity to the White House and Capitol, have sharp ears for any subdued backstairs gossip, and an uncanny power for sensing currents and undercurrents of popular feeling. Hence it has become a joke among them to hear the Masonic lodges boast of their achievement in this affair. Hence, too, the rather pointed things they have to say about the financial debacle of the Alexandria Monument.

It is one of the cruel tricks of fate that the Catholic Church is about the only body which has won anything very definite and appreciable from the Bicentennial celebration. What did the Catholic Church gain? First, it has been brought out that Washington was not so ardent a Mason as the bicentennial orators would have us believe. From certain irrefragable documents which have come to light during this year, it is certain that he attended comparatively few lodge meetings, though this would not have entailed much inconvenience; that he was only passingly interested in the activities of the lodge; that he was so indifferent as Grand Master that were a man to assume his attitude today he would forthwith be deprived of office. He had more Catholic friends and was on terms of greater friendship and intimacy with them than we have so far been led to believe. He had more supporters among Catholics, especially Irish and German settlers in this land and the French and Polish volunteers during the Revolution, than has been allowed for up to this time. Catholics understood his ideals of patriotism better (because members of a catholic body) than Masons, who are essentially insular and clannish. We never realized the veneration borne him by the Catholic body until the publication by Dr. Peter Guilday of Archbishop Carroll's touching eulogy, and the exhaustive life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton by Dr. Joseph Gurn. We allowed to slip from our memories the handsome bequests of money to the cause of the American Revolution by the French clergy out of their own pockets. All these facts were brought home to the minds of our people by printed and spoken word, by drama and pageant (especially at Yorktown and Richmond), which would have never been heard or seen but for the Bicentennial celebration. Catholics need no longer nurture the feeling that they are here only by tolerance.

This revived sense of solidarity and consciousness was seen to best advantage at the Catholic observance of the bicentennial on the grounds of the Catholic University on Decoration Day last year. It was the only celebration worthy of the jubilee in respect to numbers and patriotic enthusiasm. Over 60,000 people were fully alive to the meaning of the hour, and the electric fervor of the crowd was broadcast to all the nation by Dr. Peter Guilday in words that were completely compelling because shorn of all bombast and ballyhoo, of all exaggeration of the Catholic contributions to the story of our national beginnings, of all over-accentuation of the mutual understanding of George Washington and the Catholics of his day. It was generally whispered around Washington that this address was a very bitter pill for the Masons—all the more so as the impeccable historical methods and accuracy and the gracious manner of presenting the facts by the Doctor left no loophole. The presence of a collateral descendant of Washington, in the persons of a Catholic priest, at the various observances under Catholic auspices in surrounding cities drove home the truth that one need not fore-swear genuine American traditions in order to profess loyal Catholicism.

The Committee could not belittle the impressiveness of the Catholic outpouring at the Catholic University in memory of Washington. Hence no one was surprised when the head of the Bicentennial Committee suggested in an open letter that Catholics all over the land stage similar celebrations in their respective localities. It will not do, in all justice to the writer of this letter, to read a subtly malign hint or sinister suggestion into it. It was a manly and honorable confession on the part of one who was most interested and worked hardest for the success of the bicentennial that Catholics were about the only ones during this year who kept high festival in anything like a fitting way in honor of the Father of our Country.

We have yet to hear anyone suggesting that any city or body seek to emulate the Masonic observance of the Bicentennial. There is every reason to believe that no one will ever hold up this celebration as a model of its kind in any respect. In the meantime, it seems more than futile to trumpet the Masonic sympathies of George Washington. Perhaps Masons, with access to knowledge which is inaccessible to the outsider, could not find the heart to warm up to the occasion because they had discovered that Washington was nothing more, in spirit at least, than a "knife-and-fork Mason," as Albert Pike called those who did not translate the Masonic gospel into everyday life.

THEOLOGY

God is the beauty of the earth,
The sorrow and joy of love.
God is the pain and glory of birth,
The serpent, the lamb, and the dove.
God is all that the soul desires,
Of all our loves the best.
God is the light of homely fires
And our long-awaited rest.

KENTON KILMER.

Back of Business

IT is important that there be the right sort of action these days. Big, ponderous plans alone will be in vain unless they contain the ingredient of a saner sense than has heretofore been shown by high officials.

The gigantic plan of Franklin D. Roosevelt for developing the Tennessee Valley cannot be justified in my opinion, on the grounds of either an emergency or of far-sighted economic planning. We are facing a real emergency today in the misery of more than 12,000,000 unemployed. Of these, Mr. Roosevelt hopes to give employment to 200,000 persons within one year. They would be paid wages, and the wages would amount to about twenty per cent of the cost of the one-year project. In other words, if we spent the same money by simply handing it over (in cash or in commodities) to the unemployed, we could help five times as many, or 1,000,000 persons.

If unemployment would include a mere three or four million, we may put a flourishing river valley ahead of their personal plight. But if one-fourth of the nation walks in the dark of need and despair, we have no right to think of business first, and to help distress casually.

Nor does the Muscle Shoals project show an appreciation of economic realities. As a Government proposition, it provides the expenditure of many hundred millions of dollars—at a time when a \$2,000,000,000 deficit threatens the financial stability of, and public confidence in, the Government. It is unthinkable at this time that the Administration could assume any additional obligations, no matter how lucrative they may appear in the long run.

The project involves the reclamation of flooded bottom lands for agriculture. But where is the logic of a situation in which the Government exerts pressure upon the farmer to restrict his production, while on the other hand the incoming Administration intends to raise and increase the facilities for more agricultural production?

Water-power development to spread cheap electricity throughout the farms and cities is another essential point in the Tennessee program. Those who have followed scientific investigation into the more efficient use of coal are aware that the time is near when coal will furnish power more cheaply than water. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that other points of the program, for instance, the creation of flood control, reforestation, as well as the elimination of non-profitable lands from farming use, are well taken.

Its weakness is that it points too far into the future, but works with the rotten tools of the past. It is based upon the profit and production system. It points to greater possibilities for the free play of greed, of speculation and competition. What we need is not more land but more rights on the land we have; the man of the future is not the producer but the consumer. And no scheme should pass which does not consider these two inherent principles.

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD.

Education

College Dramatics

DANIEL M. O'CONNELL, S.J.

THE winter months are the open season for college dramatics. Plays of various flocks are offered to the public by duly licensed institutions for higher education. The collegiate tradition for giving dramatic performances is a venerable one, and has been retained despite many another educational tradition being cast overboard as so much airplane impedimenta. No high-school or college debating team ever argued the theoretical value of college dramatics. It is cheerfully accepted as an educational axiom. But when it comes to the quality of the college play, your esthetic eye will need at times a powerful and sympathetic microscope to discover a vestigial remnant of the venerable tradition. Culture and morality as guiding or restraining characteristics in choosing the drama frequently disappear in the emergence of finance.

The play is the thing, but the first thing too often is to make money on the play. This kind of an open season for choosing a play has had so many fatalities among Catholic college ideals as to demand a restraining license.

The latest offering that can be leased from Broadway is frequently found as the chosen play. At times, alas, the copyright seems to carry with it the restriction that no crudeness of language or thought be deleted from the manuscript. I have sat through and suffered "sittings" through performances of such plays. Generally I was with a fellow priest, both of us acting on the "encouraging college dramatics" ideal. Speaking for myself I have blushed, educationally (I am sure) if not physiologically. For the moment I envied the freedom of Claudius, King of Denmark, who could at least cry out "away" and of Polonius with his "Give o'er the play," when they were made uncomfortable by the cry of players. Truth to tell, I fancied that the Catholic parents present were, Hamlet-like, riveting their eyes to my collar and cloth and educational ideals. On occasions, too, my sacerdotal companion was further horrified by the college orchestra which harrowed up his musical soul with an inter-act program of jazz dance pieces. Even I recognized the impropriety of the latter though nature has hardly willed me the legal per cent of musical appreciation. Need I further add to the harping of adverse criticism by stating that these programs are not always staged by technical or professional schools, where less attention is supposedly paid to arts, but by colleges of liberal arts?

I find, though, from my notes of some years' taking, that I have not completed my disagreeable philippic *in re* Catholic college plays. The students' newspapers frequently contain dramatic reviews of current plays. Why, I do not know, except that the theaters feel that they flatter the immature, impressionable collegian by making him a dramatic critic. Elizabeth Jordan of AMERICA, Dana Skinner of the *Commonweal*, Mrs. Euphemia Van Rensselaer Wyatt of the *Catholic World*, and reviewers for the "Bulletin of the Catholic Theater Movement" would

feel a swooning reaction, I am sure, were they at times to read in a Catholic college publication more than faint praise of a play which they unmitigatedly censored as in the "strictly dishonorable" class. Such "nature in the raw" advertisements, whether gratuitous or bought, whether designated "advertisement" or lacking this pure food label, are surely out of place in any part of a Catholic paper of any kind, and all the more in a Catholic college organ. Incidentally I sometimes wonder if an active faculty censor for these same Catholic college organs has become another forgotten man.

But, I shall be duly informed, college students of this technocracy age will not participate in any but the "best plays of 1932-1933"; much less will they consider your hoary classical revivals. Begging your pardon for my optimistic fundamentalism in believing that college dramatics should be educational, I present the following facts: (1) Some male Catholic and (2) most female Catholic colleges, (3) some non-Catholic ones, produce plays that appeal to the use of reason and to culture and are not merely ephemeral. For number 1, I am indebted to the mimeographed notes of Rev. Joseph A. Ryan, S.J., Dean of Regis college, Denver, on college dramatics, a subject which he chose for discussion at the recent meeting of Jesuit deans of the Chicago and Missouri provinces. For numbers 2 and 3, I have clippings in proof, as well as ocular and auricular evidence. Here I am glad to pay a well deserved tribute to the large gathering under number 2. In fact, with incipient 1933 I would go so far as to drink a Lake Michigan toast to the Catholic ladies' colleges in the hope they will never deviate from their present dramatic ideals. After this gallantry, they will surely bear with me if I remind them to hold fast what they have; that it is easier to destroy than to build.

I am indebted to Father Ryan's notes for this cheering news. The University of Santa Clara recently produced the following plays: "The Mission Play of Santa Clara," "The Light Eternal," "The Passion Play of Santa Clara," "The Weaver of Tarsus." They are examples of high ideals in dramatic education. I am glad to quote Father Ryan's sane conclusion from his study of Catholic college plays: "(Catholic) colleges might well cling to classical plays, passion plays, pageants, and dramas of very special merit, and in general refuse to follow the lead of other colleges."

Busy administrators in our Catholic colleges are apt to say: "We give full authority and therefore responsibility to the dramatic department and journalism department." In view of past events, I, for one, would not absolve the administrators on such a defense. There is need of dramatic reform and this can come only from administrators. They could hardly be busy with a more important duty.

Even though it is a financial setback, a college play should be an educational advancement for the students participating. As a minimum criterion, it should have some lines in it worth remembering. Education in any field to be worth while must be against the grain of academic inertia and of the easiest way out. In general, educational symposiums for the public are reckoned as a

financial loss. Friends of Catholic theater ideals will agree that our college plays should have some general characteristics of an educational symposium.

But if our male colleges must put on the unproven and ephemeral in dramatics, please let them take time and courage to delete vulgarity of word and thought in the performances; free Catholic parents in the audience from blushing; from listening to the college arts orchestra practicing its next jazz-dance numbers; omit recommending "nature in the raw" plays from the columns of their literary publications. Most Catholic parents and students, too, I hope, do not care for such "toasted" offerings.

Finally, I believe that our Catholic colleges could well scrap much of their "being up-to-date" machinery and revert to the handicraft of traditional, difficult, but proven educational arts. I offer to Catholic colleges the ephemeral, cheap college play for immediate sacrificial destruction.

Sociology

Religion and Crime Statistics

A. A. REUTER

ONE little sentence, quoted from Dr. John R. Miner's recent article in the *American Mercury* on "Do the Churches Prevent Crime?", gives us a key to the mind of Harry Elmer Barnes, liberal columnist and lecturer, on the part the Church plays in preventing crime. In his usual three-paragraph way of leading up to a theme, Dr. Barnes, writing for a newspaper syndicate, explains that on this subject, as upon all others, we have those who cannot resist taking to extremes: "The religiously inclined criminologist who tells us that most criminals come from the un-churched and unbelieving classes, and the village atheist who insists that most, if not all criminals, are devout believers."

Rejecting either position as inaccurate, wishful, and extreme (which attitude would be quite justified except for traces of exaggeration), Dr. Barnes in his naive liberal way rejoices that at last we are beginning to get factual information on this highly controversial subject. The unassailable data which he presents are supplied in part by Frank Steiner, whose analyzed statistics in his book "Religion and Roguery," show that 84 per cent of the convicts in the penitentiaries of the United States claimed religious affiliation. Prof. Carl Murchison is quoted as saying that the church population of the Maryland penitentiary is far larger in proportion than the church population of the State. And lastly, we are referred to the work of Dr. Dunn, "The Church and Crime in the United States," where it is claimed that investigation of the religious state of the inmates of twenty-seven penitentiaries and nineteen reform schools throughout the United States showed 71.8 per cent of the prisoners to be members of some church.

But our glimpse into the liberal mind comes when Dr. Barnes, reviewing the sum statistics of Drs. Steiner, Murchison, and Dunn, concludes that, "Pending further study-

we may accept Dr. Miner's view that there is little evidence that the churches play any major part in preventing crime." It will not be my purpose here to refute Dr. Barnes' contention by mounting statistics, because if I should defend religion as a crime deterrent by producing figures up to 71.8 or eighty-four per cent, I might invite censure upon myself as being a believing, wishful extremist. I prefer to argue principles. Principles, if correctly understood and applied, are able to resolve every difficulty; and as a norm for determining psychological and sociological values, principles are safer and more accurate than statistics. It will be argued, of course, that results should determine principles; that the worth of a system must be judged by its effectiveness, and by its ability to produce results. This argument would carry much weight, but for the fact that it is not always easy to determine just when results are results, as seems to be the case with the liberal figures on religion and crime. The modern art of appealing to statistics has come to be more an art of converting figures into results, than of using figures to convey results. Believe it or not, it seems that figures have come to be almost the sole weapon of those who minimize, or who have never seriously attempted the study of principles. My aversion to statistics does not come from any failure to understand their significance, but from a deep-seated dislike for their unintelligent over-use.

We of the defense are accused of commonly assuming that religion is all that stands between peaceable society and perpetual anarchy. Now it does not occur to me that all, or even a considerable number of those who defend religion as a major factor in crime prevention, hold that view. How many theologians and believing criminologists have ever expressed the opinion that religion is all that stands between us and perpetual anarchy? It is one thing to say that religion is the most effective agency working against crime, but it is quite another to say that religion is the only force that stands between us and perpetual violence and bloodshed. Government, for instance, and the police, are forces standing between society and chaos, and no clergyman or believing criminologist has ever doubted the value of either in the preservation of order.

To discuss the liberal view that religion plays no major part in preventing crime, we might begin by endeavoring to learn just how they view the Church in its capacity as a crime-deterrent. How many liberals, if asked, could give a precise and complete definition of religion? How many could converse intelligently on the sanctions of religion, or on the basis of morality? Do they understand in the true Christian sense the relation that exists between the individual and his God? Obviously they do not comprehend in how many intimate ways religion tends to develop strong, noble, and responsible character. Times without number, in fact whenever a liberal discusses the social value of religion, we find as an illustration an expression which runs something like this: "Just how any system can hope for positive results in character development, which has no other inducement than a promise of reward or punishment effective only after death, is not

quite clear to one of liberal persuasion." The philosophy behind such a view is probably that eternity is always at a safe distance, or rather, perhaps, that eternity might not be eternity in the theological sense. This attitude however is not shared by the man of sincere faith. To his mind religion is not some mere experimental or speculative human thing such as science, the 'ologies, and statistics, but something revealed, something definite; and heaven and hell something more real than even death and taxes.

Besides, the motive supplied by the believing person's faith is not his only inducement to good behavior. It is an additional inducement. It is something the unbeliever does not have. The absence in a human being of the moral incentive supplied by religious faith might properly be considered a kind of disability. It is a deficiency that ought to be remedied in the interest of the individual, as well as that of society. Many non-believers seem to hold the view that we regard the religious sanction for morality and behavior as a kind of substitute for their ideal of social responsibility. They seem to think that religion, by stressing the eternal, minimizes or destroys the individual's sense of obligation to society. The truth, however, is that religion places an emphasis upon social responsibility by pointing out why we have duties to society.

The conscientious believer can name far more reasons for his good behavior, than can a mere socially conscious man, because for him conduct has a double sanction. He believes that crime for him would be a double offense. He believes with a faith unknown to the liberal and the non-believer, that murder, theft, and vice are crimes against a God in Whose presence he must always live, and from Whose law not even death will offer escape. Besides this very effective deterrent, he is quite as social conscious as his non-religious neighbor. Up to a certain degree this social consciousness can exist independently of religion, but when augmented by a firm religious faith, it becomes a real factor in character development. A very pertinent question now suggests itself: does his sense of social responsibility, unaided, influence the unbeliever against a life of crime as readily and effectively as the belief in a personal God and the inescapable sanction of His law shapes the social character of the truly religious person? I do not hesitate to give the negative reply. If anyone contemplating a life of crime deliberately throws his faith to the winds, I am not very hopeful that any mere ideal stressing of social duty will be able to deter him from his evil ambition.

Whatever may be the deterring influence of wholesome fear, it should always be made plain that Christianity is essentially not a religion of fear. It is true that it stresses the fear that goes along with solicitude, but it is also true that its chief and dominant note is love. Men are interested in advancing civilization, they appreciate order, they love their country, but they can never love these as they would love God, if they but knew Him. Moved by love for their country and the civilization it represents, men in their nobler moments often exclaim "my native land!" or "our country!" but it is only to God they say "Father." Social consciousness can produce heroes, but only religion

can produce saints. And to be a saint demands the finer moral fiber.

Again, I have always been curious to know how our statisticians determine just who's who in the criminal world. By this I mean to ask how they decide when a prisoner should be classed a believer or a non-believer. What are the requirements for membership in the lodge of the criminal ex-religious? Is it necessary that records of the prisoners indicate past formal membership in a religious body, or merely that such membership, however remote, existed somewhere in the family tree? Or do they give a theological intelligence test? If the former method of grading is used, it ought not surprise us if some day a convict is found claiming membership in an ancient cult of the nature worshippers through the lineage of some remote, perhaps simian ancestor.

While this, of course, is a little overdrawn, it is hardly more misleading or more unfair than to indict religion with failure as a crime preventative, after extending religious recognition to each individual's ghostly fantasy. Especially is this true in modern times, when the word *religion* has come to be so decidedly all-inclusive. Coined as a term to denote the solemn, objective, and purposeful relation that exists between God and man, the word in its modern usage includes even the strangest and most ridiculous sophistries, providing they contain a semblance of the spiritual, the mysterious, or the grotesque. It would be more than amusing to be permitted to question the religious views of those prisoners who had succeeded in passing the liberal's theological intelligence test.

I think it a serious injustice against religion as well as an offense against reason, to charge a career of crime to the inefficiency of whatever small amount of religious influence may at one time have been present in the life of a now notorious criminal. More profound reflection probably would convince the liberal statisticians that insufficient religion rather than inefficient religion lies at the root of America's ever increasing crime problem. Before the statisticians do any more grading, I would suggest that they be required to submit to a test by a board of competent theologians. The purpose will be to provide us with an idea of the size of mesh used in the statistician's religious sieve. If they must work with figures, I take the liberty to suggest that the statisticians furnish us with figures showing for how many months, years, or decades, the now religious convicts had given up the faith, before venturing upon their life of crime.

GRANADA

On that day, when from my lessening memory fade
Your glories,
That Moorish chiefs and Christian kings have made,
I shall remember still
Your steep and stony hill,
For I espied her there—
Dusky maid, with rose-decked hair,
Passing along the old and white-washed wall
With her black goats, and heard
Their faint complaining call.

AILEEN TEMPLETON.

With Scrip and Staff

GOVERNMENT researches, at the behest of a troubled California tax-payer, reveal at last that an "ordinary flea" can leap thirteen inches horizontally and seven and three-quarter inches vertically. Under normal conditions, a frog can leap three feet; under deep emotion five feet, and under deep emotion with firm footing, six feet.

Firm footing, if not deep emotion, is presupposed by the well-known quarterly, *Hound and Horn*, for its readers, who are neither fleas nor frogs—or parasites.

Now the editors of *H. and H.*, to get ahead with the story, are offering a prize for the best piece of fiction and for the best piece of verse by "an undergraduate of any American college or university," under, of course, usual conditions, etc., etc.

Interest was shown by Mary Shaw, one of the *Pilgrim's* correspondents, who was disposed, being up to date, to view *H. and H.* with kindly eye; yet closer inspection caused some qualms. She observed in writing to me concerning the proposed contest to which she had been invited; and the April-June, 1932, number which she had obtained as a sample:

In my judgment one of the short stories is not fit to be read. An article on "The Problem of Christian Philosophy" seemed to me to be a vague jumble of phrases and anti-Catholic in tone. In my opinion the literary value of the magazine is small.

It is my conviction that the magazine is a Communistic publication and that Communism is wedging its way into our midst by the ruse of this contest. One of the stories gives a sordid picture of farm life. "From a Russian Diary" is such badly twisted English that it is scarcely readable.

The announcement of the contest conducted by the *Hound and Horn* is no longer on our bulletin board, but I wonder how many students of other Catholic colleges are unwittingly entering this contest or have already done so.

In a spirit of fair play, Miss Shaw mailed me a copy of the said issue, so that I could scrutinize it at my leisure.

WITH so many other things to peruse, why spend much time on *Hound and Horn*? But I was curious about the "Communist" article, which gave the Moscow impressions of e. e. cummings. Among these, are the following (for your assistance: he is describing his official guide):

Down chewed stairs plunging, resume clumsily the now merely nervous street, the mercilessly general more aggressive vibration, the unskillfully less infinite obsession. "Do please have lunch with me! We can stroll around afterwards and I'll show you the old and new Gay-Pay-Oo buildings—of course you know what the 'three letters' stand for; O not at all, quite the contrary, the Gay-Pay-Oo is a most benevolent organization, all those rumors which one hears are sheer nonsense: I tell you, quite the most intelligent and delightful people I know are in the Gay-Pay-Oo; you'll see for yourself when you meet them—the whole idea is entirely different, my dear fellow: all members of the Gay Pay-Oo are persons of the highest calibre, especially when chosen for their idealism; it's an honour, you understand: nonono, they're not police at all, they're guardians of the proletariat, and quite the most splendid organization in Soviet Russia—altogether noble

and unselfish—why, I've been accused of being in the Gay-Pay-Oo myself . . . but what were we talking about: yes. Well, if you like we'll go to a really Russian place; except that I'm afraid you won't be able to stand it—the smell is pretty bad. I took a couple of American friends there recently, and they didn't seem to appreciate the food—"

And the ensuing ("Virgil" is the said guide): long gently rising street. A priest passes, motheaten—Virgil gloats "They're few and far between, now: O not at all, that persecution story is ridiculous my dear fellow; the point is, anyone who still wants to serve The Lord can do so, but The Lord's servant must have a useful occupation or starve; people have awakened to the fact that religion is opium: in a worker's republic there's no place for parasites . . . excuse me." Halting, peeps cautiously into his shirt; resumes "a false alarm. Yes, religion is inextricably bound up with the family; and since the safety of the state depends on the abolition of the family, religion must go. Of course it's hard for some of us who've been educated according to bourgeois traditions; but if we're intelligent we see there's no other way—not that I miss my religion, quite the contrary. Odear, you really must stay at least six months; there are so many things to understand, so many thrilling aspects of this new world—"

There is no doubt as to the impression left upon e. e. cummings by the "cityless city, the peopleless people," by "Moscow of the inexorably obsessing mentality." It is the curious mixture of ineffectiveness, collapse, "tension," and "compulsory psychic promiscuity" which one associates with a certain type of custodial institution.

MAY I crave indulgence, therefore, for replying thus to Miss Shaw:

That those were your impressions, my dear Mary Shaw, of *Hound and Horn* that is to say quite disconcerting impressions of possibly some degree of intellectual pretiosity combined with stylistic doing it for itself and then a good deal of what might be a willed unintelligibility wire-drawn at times over a tremendous surface to which is added such a plethora of repetition and parenthesis not to speak of allusions not so much to the background of literary memory as to the hinterland of sense memory is what might be expected particularly if you have not been Hound and Horning very much or with the devotion that such a pursuit would naturally imply. For they assume that one must become assuefacted and custom-lapped into the thought-word stream and must have learned gently though not too impatiently to shunt aside that natural impulse which comes to the worst of us to wonder what use it may be or what it is all about.

However when you transfer the level of your critical campaign to the heights of moral censure you see rising up not so much as previously the mere question of whether it pleases bewilders saddens or excites irrepressible risibilities as the question whether poison may be administered to the mind unsuspectingly lulled into acquiescence by compliance with sound and imagery. Of course you as a critic will not take everything merely by the first impression but will seek to weigh and estimate by circumstance and tendency rather than by the purely patent rind of the world or phrase am I not right?

Since to discuss each and every item in the issue would be direly tedious and moreover be beyond my own poor mental capacity may I be permitted to make some brief

comment upon those particular numbers which you have yourself selected for a what do you think of that?

You see that when Etienne Gilson writes on St. Thomas he is supposed to be orthodox being a great Catholic philosopher famous as leader of the neo-scholastic movement in France and then when you disentangle his language you find he has in this article thrown light on just a question which many of us have long worried over. Indeed I think he has some shrewd things there quite penetrating and I should not think one would object to him unless one were such a dyed-in-wool augustinian that Aristotle would seem not only incapable of Baptism but a downright intruder.

Now about the gentleman who saw in Russia the thingless things and the streetless streets and the foodless food and the non-men women and was plagued and amused yet more plagued than amused by the interminable babbittness of Soviet self-advertising if he is a Communist or means to preach Communism he is doing it upside down because it is a keen satire on the whole business.

As to the immorality or morality of speckled stories when you come back to the whole speckled-story proposition I do not like this morbid and physiological emphasis on phases of life which thoroughly sane people would not emphasize so I have no brief for that part of *Hound and Horn*. Still one need not condemn the magazine specifically thereby since the Hound and Horners are working not as a protest or deviation from the established and customary conservative turn of thought but as a counter current to the unprincipled degraded groups which have monopolized a sophisticated style. And a distorted emphasis on ugliness though regrettable is to be distinguished from the perversity of those who select the sensually tempting for their field. We may see in the magazine an organ of a cleaner sort of Humanists who are climbing up on the side of the angels out of the mud though they retain some mud in the process and after all when people are trying to climb out of the mud and get up with the angels isn't it sometimes a good thing to help them up rather than to slap them too vigorously for not having been up there all the time? If you want to follow the new Humanist movement it has been treated recently in *Thought* for March, 1932.

Please excuse this unsatisfactory answer which implies, too, that it might not be such a bad thing to keep in the contest of the *Hound and Horn*, letting them know here and there what you think of them for good or for bad and then, too, you can say a prayer for

THE PILGRIM.

P. S. "Have a heart," or to that effect, writes Mary Shaw in response to the above blast, observing that studious youth has its problems. And she adds, most pertinently: "Do you not think that if the climbing magazine editor needs a boost, the climbing reader needs one too, also the climbing schoolgirl who is learning, or seeking to learn how to appraise?"

Now, while I am a-postscripting, let me apologize for crowding out my good friend the Anchorite until next week.

P.

Literature**The Poet's Diction**

THEODORE MAYNARD

OF style, in a general sense, it is impossible for me to treat here at any length. I can do no more than point out certain truisms, which are often ignored; and certain truths, which are not always recognized.

First of all, style can only exist in relation to a certain thing, whether that thing be tennis, or fiddling, or writing. It is no more than a good method of performance, and must be judged by the success of the performance.

In writing, the thing to be said is inseparable from the way it is said. The thing to be said should determine the way it is said. Only out of notable subject matter can a good style spring, or, to put it in another way, only a writer who has much to say can say it well. To be a great writer it is necessary to be a great man.

This is true even in those cases where it would seem that style is not needed, where only information is involved. But the scientist, or the mathematician, they too can impart what they know only by means of finding a style for the doing of it. The philosopher can impart the fruits of his abstract thinking under one condition—that he does it beautifully. And all great philosophers and scientists have been able to write beautifully, as may be seen by reading them. Plato and Augustine and Aquinas and Bergson would never have been heard of had they not been stylists; for their method of expression is their method of thought.

The style of the poet will, of course, be somewhat more heightened than the style of the abstract thinker; but that is only because there is a difference in the matter to be imparted.

The poet, as the philosopher, will not think of style apart from the thing he is trying to say. But if he says it adequately at all, it will only be because he has hit upon the right way of saying it. Clever young people would therefore, do well to keep a blue pencil handy for deleting their purple patches: these are certain to be bad. Yet I believe there are men who make a living "stylizing" books for clumsy authors. All they can do, of course, is to correct grammatical errors, shorten sentences, cut out redundant matter, and tidy up a mess. Nobody can *add* style, either to his own work or to another's. If it is not organic with the material, it is nothing. In fact awkward, unpretentious writing is to be preferred to cheap pretence at fine writing.

Style of some sort or other a man must have, whatever he does, for style is nothing but the method by which a thing is done. Therefore style may be either undistinguished, or bad, or individualized. But there is another style, not often noted, not often attained, style absolute, pure, perfect. I note a difference between undistinguished style, the style of most of us, and bad style, which is fortunately employed by few. An undistinguished style we can forgive; a bad style is an abomination, because it is the mark of a man with bad taste.

As a general rule, simplicity is best, as it is always safest. The Koran has a verse which tells us that Paradise lies under the shadow of swords. And he who essays the tremendous had best go to battle armed in adamant. The steep roads to the poetic heights are littered with the corpses of those conceited or stupid enough to think they could get there, like the young fool in Longfellow's poem, by waving a banner upon which is inscribed "Excelsior."

It is the hankering after grandeur, and the notion that grandeur is to be obtained through the use of sonorous, mouth-filling syllables, that has so often done harm to poetry. During one age it resulted in bombast, during another in a frigid conventionality of a different kind; the poets of the Augustan age, abandoning the excesses of the seventeenth century, seeking a diction that was clear and precise, froze and hardened to such a degree that the protest of Romanticism was needed. And Romanticism, in its turn, tended very quickly to the over-ripe, the luscious, the sweet. The problem before all poets is to find a style that shall be rich, but not too ornate; austere, and yet not banal; poetic, and yet not essentially different from ordinary speech. For the words most powerfully suggestive in poetry are the simpler words that have gathered an emotional significance because they most commonly meet the needs of life.

The trouble is that words are something more than mathematical signs; they have a meaning not to be found in any dictionary. In justice to his readers the poet has to consider the dictionary meaning of his words; in justice to his poetry he has to consider their associations, and their suggestive significance.

Lascelles Abercrombie makes the point in the charming parable about the "Naming of the Beasts":

Adam, it appears, made some difficulty about the business—a purely logical difficulty. But Eve was ready for him. If Adam would drive the beasts in front of her, she would name them as they went by. So, as the first beast ran past her, Eve calls out: "Well, that, of course, is a bear." "Now whatever makes you call it a bear?" says Adam. "Why," says Eve, "it looks like a bear."

It is here that verse gives the writer an advantage that does not belong to prose, at any rate not to anything like the same extent. Verse is different from prose, and that obvious fact has led to unfortunate deductions. Poets, not content with their advantage, which is theirs only if they fully understand its possibilities and its limits, have often been inclined to make for poetry a special language, little related to that of prose.

The direct, straightforward speech aimed at by Wordsworth, therefore, was all to the general advantage of poetry, even if it did lead him sometimes to appalling flat-footedness. What he did was really to serve notice that all "poetic licenses" had been canceled, that inversion rarely adds force to the style and is in the vast majority of instances the refuge of a lazy and slovenly writer, and that ornament for its own sake is meretricious and cheap.

With regard to the vocabulary of the poet it might be to some advantage to point out certain facts. While any word and any phrase might conceivably find a place in poetry, it is clear enough, surely, that certain words and

phrases—those that are abstract, or hackneyed—are not likely to make for vividness or the creation of intense images. But, then, such words and phrases should, if possible, be avoided even in prose.

It must be granted that the language of poetry is far more intense than that of any other form of literary expression. But it would be going too far to say that prose is to be used only for exposition and information, the abstract and the matter of fact. For prose may have a great deal of poetry in it.

Indeed, we may affirm that it is very hard to come across prose which does not have some poetical quality, some union of thought and feeling, and we often come across lines written in perfect meter which are quite devoid of poetry.

Professor Bliss Perry quotes a remarkable instance of versification, with rhyme, too, and in the "In Memoriam," stanza form, which he found, printed as prose, in a book called "The Parallelogram of Forces." Here it is:

And hence no force, however great,
Can draw a cord, however fine,
Into a horizontal line
Which shall be absolutely straight.

The statement could not possibly be put with more beautiful compactness and lucidity, and nothing could be more prosaic. Yet it is in verse.

These curious coincidences do occur; but far more frequently it happens that correct verse, the writing of which has given the author a great deal of trouble, fails completely to be poetry. It is not bad enough to be funny; it is sufficiently competent enough in technique; but the breath of beauty is absent. Nevertheless, we may say that while verse is not necessarily poetry, and though much prose has poetic elements, poetry does demand for its full expression what meter, rhyme and stanza pattern provide.

While the poet should avoid words, or an order of words, or a syntax, that could not be used in prose, he will have many a phrase which he would hardly employ except in his verses. We should be careful not to assert that he must *never* use an archaism, or a contraction, or an inversion which would not be suitable in prose; but the more that he avoids these so-called poetic usages the better.

Moreover, though the poet uses a larger vocabulary as a rule than does the prose writer—for he needs them to sharpen, and strengthen and intensify what he has to say—his *possible* vocabulary is smaller than that proper to prose, because of the many hopelessly "unpoetical" or definitely prosaic words and phrases he finds himself obliged to avoid.

We might represent this in a diagram in which a larger circle would stand for all the available words in a language; a smaller circle, falling within it, that intensely selected vocabulary which is proper to poetry. But I think we should have to indicate the smaller circle as falling slightly outside the larger one. Unless we are fanatical rigorists, we must admit that it should be allowed to obtrude a little. A very little.

REVIEWS

Directory of Catholic Schools and Colleges. 1932-33. Washington: The National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Under the editorial supervision of Dr. George Johnson, of the Catholic University, the Directory has become a model of what a reference book of this type should be. All who have undertaken, even on a much smaller scale, the compilation of any similar work, will realize the immense labor back of the production of this volume. Extreme care must be exercised to insure accuracy in reproducing statistics, for there is an imp in every printing shop who loves to wreak havoc with graphs and tables. As far as tested, the entries and statistics are correct, and for the accuracy of the others, the standing in the educational world of Dr. Johnson and of the Conference's statistician, James E. Cummings, is ample guarantee. The Directory lists the Catholic schools of every grade throughout the whole of the United States, and for every institution gives the appropriate details. No other directory can compare with it in this respect, yet there is none of that "padding" which looks well but misleads. To pastors, teachers, educational administrators, editors, and, in general, to all who are asked to recommend a school, the newest edition of the Directory will be invaluable.

P. L. B.

Why Catholics Believe. By MARTIN J. SCOTT, S.J. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons. \$1.50.

The veteran Catholic apologist adds another to his already long list of popular defenses and explanations of Catholic Faith. His present purpose is to show the Church as she really is, "not what Catholics are falsely accused of believing, but what and why they believe" (p. vii). This Father Scott does with his usual clarity and precision. He is a master at quiet, unobtrusive writing which has a subtle power of guiding the reader into serious thinking. One begins to think quite naturally and inevitably as Father Scott, with almost conversational simplicity, unfolds each thought. Take for example the chapters on "Faith" and on "Judgment." Like the rest of the book, they are man-to-man. There is no flash of epigrams, though memory will long cling to a sentence such as: "God who has promised mercy has not promised time" (p. 225). There is no attempt at fine writing, but the thoughts are clothed in a genteel manner so that attention is not attracted unduly to their dress. All in all, this is a splendid apologetic, understandable by the simplest, yet instructive and intriguing to the educated and even to the theologian.

F. P. LeB.

Liberalism in the South. By VIRGINIUS DABNEY. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. \$3.50.

Virginus Dabney is a Southerner, the son of Dr. Richard Heath Dabney, of the University of Virginia. The effect of his "examination of liberal movements in the fields of politics, education, religion, race relations, industry, literature, journalism, and women's rights over a period of more than a century and a half and throughout an area several times as large as any European country except Russia" is to find both a tradition and a heritage of liberalism in the South, exemplified today by such men and women as Gerald W. Johnson, Dr. Beverly Tucker, Jr., James Hardy Dillard, Dr. W. L. Poteat, Ashby Jones, Governor Pollard, Lucy R. Mason, Ellen Glasgow, Richard Reid, and others too numerous to mention. He would have us look at the South through the eyes of a Jefferson, a Grady, an Underwood, or an Atticus G. Haygood, rather than as the home of such headlined nuisances as the Bleases, Vardamans, Heflins, and Cannons. Mr. Dabney's practised and witty style carries lightly the burden of study which his story required. There is no attempt to McKenzie the South: no gibing or ranting over Bible belt, hillbillies, and what not. There runs throughout the spirit of sympathy, of intense admiration for the best that the South has stood for in the way of ideals or achievements. But problems are squarely faced.

The race question, particularly, is not minced or glossed over, and Mr. Dabney frankly recognizes that "there is a growing school of thought in the South which holds that any man, no matter what his race, who is qualified to vote ought to be permitted to vote, and that it is wholly unjust for election officials to disqualify thousands of Negroes arbitrarily while permitting other thousands of white illiterates to troop to the polls," even though this view is not held by "anything remotely approaching a majority of Southern whites." Lynching and education are likewise dealt with in a spirit of justice; and a sharp demarcation drawn between "kluxery" and those thinking elements in the South which recognize ordinary human rights. On page 274 there is an interesting characterization of the gentleman who received the German naval commander when clad in green pajamas, and recently had the Senate of the United States by the throat. In general, Mr. Dabney's studies will make an excellent handbook for all Democrats after March 4, even those who are not Cabinet members. It will help them to discriminate between politicians and statesmen. The interesting chapter on the "Emancipation of Woman" is marred by the author's falling for the old, oft-refuted slur concerning the early Fathers of the Church and the status of woman.

J. L. F.

Pioneer Days in Arizona. By FRANK C. LOCKWOOD. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$4.00.

Non-Catholic historians of the State universities of the Southwest have discovered a new world. Naturally eager to learn the past origins of their present civilization and culture, they have been digging in the hills, and they now realize they have struck gold. For back beyond the Yankee bad men and Indian fighters and miners and trappers they have come upon the Franciscans from Mexico, and before them the Jesuits. Where civil and military efforts at colonization failed, the Padres succeeded till greed and the enemies of religion stopped them. Out of all these heroic pioneers of God, one giant is daily looming larger than the rest. His name is Kino, a Jesuit, the Apostle of the Pimas, and explorer, cattle king, and cowboy extraordinary. The author is a prime mover of the Kino Memorial Committee organized to erect a monument to "The Padre on Horseback," the Marquette of the Southwest. From the romantic period of the mission days, the author carries the story through to 1912, the year in which Arizona closed its 400-year adolescence by becoming a State.

T. S. B.

Economic Stabilization in an Unbalanced World. By ALVIN H. HANSEN. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. \$3.00.

There has been a common complaint during the past three years that the economist has had nothing to do with the depression and has left the remedies to pseudo and amateur economists. In a measure such an opinion is true, but a timely statement of the true economist is now available. Alvin Hansen, an orthodox follower of the neo-Classical school, has analyzed the various causes and remedies of the present slump and has come to the conclusion that the real and only complete solution of the problem lies in cutting the bonds which legislation and prejudice have placed upon the free competitive market, leaving an equilibrium which would be partially stable, but which would be the most effective possible. Assuming that the World War interrupted a tendency toward such an equilibrium, Professor Hansen analyzes in turn tariffs since the War, the reparations, labor policies, investments, and technological change. All are examined with their effect toward monetary stability and productive equilibrium. The various schemes for stabilization are considered: those of population, those of production, those of a monetary character. All are treated scientifically and in a manner which is pleasing to all. Capitalism and Socialism are contrasted with Communism, and the conclusion left to the reader. Professor Hansen's book may appear a bit difficult at first, but it is so full of examples that the initiated are charmed and the non-economic-minded laity are

instructed easily and clearly in the principles of applied economic theory. One book like this is worth for its facts hundreds of the amateurish works which have poured out since November, 1929.

F. J. C.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Lights from Newman.—A. K. Maxwell deserves the thanks of the lovers of the great English Cardinal for her book "According to Cardinal Newman" (Dial. \$2.00). The sub-title of the book rather fully indicates its contents and purpose: "The Life of Christ and the Mission of the Church as told in the writings of John Henry Cardinal Newman." The result of this excellent winnowing and gathering of passages from various books and varied contexts, is a consecutive and quite complete commentary on the life of Our Lord, and of Our Blessed Mother, on the Church, the Angels, the Mass, the Holy Eucharist, etc. The search has not been a restricted one, but the compiler has roamed far afield in the ample spaces of Newman's writings and given us a book that differs markedly from the wonted "Thoughts and Sayings of . . ." A special value is added to the book by the introduction (probably his last contribution to Catholic literature) of his Excellency, Bishop Shahan.

The Mexican Problem.—A work that very much needed doing is performed by Prof. James Morton Callahan in "American Foreign Policy in Mexican Relations" (Macmillan. \$4.00). Since there is good reason to believe that political changes in Mexico will shortly bring about a larger measure of American interest in the Republic to the South, the book is timely, and its reading is recommended to all who may have anything to do in the present situation. Basing his researches on the archives of the State Department, Professor Callahan has produced a work which, while not brilliantly written, is of absorbing interest to specialists. Here the reader will find the whole sordid story of the century-long drive to acquire Mexican property and of the later economic penetration of the country, and will see how this imperialistic movement was constantly cloaked by our statesmen and diplomats in the basest hypocrisy. The chapter on the American economic invasion of Mexico under Diaz is particularly valuable in present circumstances. Unfortunately, for the story of the past twenty years Professor Callahan was forced to rely on the unreliable sources of newspaper dispatches and State Department releases. This fact seriously impairs the value of his last chapter, many of the judgments in which would be seriously questioned by anyone knowing events from the inside.

Leone B. Moats, assisted by Russell Lord, has written a vivid memoir of her days in Mexico, since the time of Porfirio Diaz, in "Thunder in Their Veins" (Century. \$2.75). Mrs. Moats gives a vivid picture of personalities and events during the revolutionary years, and incidentally confirms from personal experience all the hard things about the revolutionaries which it was once so difficult to get the American people to believe. Since she is living in Mexico at present, her criticisms of the same type of politicians now in power are suspiciously milder.

Catholic Atlas and Encyclopedia.—The promised atlas volume, companion to "Der Grosse Herder," the German popular encyclopedia, appears hand in hand with the fourth volume of the series. Entitled "Welt- und Wirtschafts atlas" (Herder. \$9.50), the volume forms an entirely independent work, with 106 principal maps, sixty-five economic maps, and general indicator. Bound in with the atlas is a detachable volume of statistics relating to every country in the world, which is to be renewed from time to time. Besides the splendid workmanship and the complete modernity of the maps, the stress laid on economics, on statistical information, and on ingenious graphic representation of the same gives the work a distinct novelty. It is an invaluable handbook for editors, teachers, and students of international affairs.

The fourth volume of "Der Grosse Herder" (Herder, \$9.50), begins with the ice-age (*Eisenseit*) and ends practically with der Gangster, so that it covers quite a bit of time. E stands for Europe, for Elephant and Everest, both of which get handsome half-tones, for England, also for Engländer (Englishmen), whose undue love for sport is carefully explained, but also their patriotism and love of family life. And F brings in France and the French; also Films, and Farben (colors, with a fine colored table), Flugzeug (airplanes), and other modern things, together with Fische and all kinds of people called Fischer; not to speak of Frauen, who are always interesting, and Festung, which bring a whiff of the World War. Besides these high-toned things, there are also such objects as Ferkel and Gänseleberpastete, so that the encyclopedia can sit on the kitchen table as well as in the manorial bookcase. As usual, the workmanship is of that German kind which for Americans is only a wish-be.

For Book Lovers.—Through the efforts of that ardent bibliophile, Edwin Valentine Mitchell, the eccentric and scholarly Isaac D'Israeli expounds his views regarding literature and life via the medium of his well-known miscellany, "Curiosities of Literature" (Appleton, \$3.00). D'Israeli himself was an astute bibliophile and one who loved to delve into the obscure and forgotten corners of literature. This condensed edition is made up of a varied collection of essays on such diverse subjects as: libraries, the recovery of lost manuscripts, the destruction of books, prefaces, patrons, and literary impostures down to methods of literary composition, diaries, and forgeries. Each essay is written in a graceful and distinctive style and permeated with a shrewd sense of observation and humor, begotten of many long hours of reflection in the reading room of the British Museum. All lovers of old and rare books and English literature in general will welcome this new edition under the capable editorship of Mr. Mitchell.

In "Selective Bibliography of American Literature, 1775-1900" (New York: William Payson, \$10.00), Bradford M. Fullerton manifests fine selective judgment, not merely in the authors presented, but in the details related of them; included are all the writers whom we would expect to find, and many of the less prominent whom we are surprised and pleased to see. Accuracy and brevity are combined with an interest that only first-hand familiarity with his matter could give.

"Garnered Sheaves" (Macmillan, \$7.50) is well named by the author, Sir James George Frazer, to whom the "Golden Bough" has brought renown. An indefatigable researcher, Frazer documents every finding, and therein lies the peculiar value of his works. They are source books for others to use, the data wherein are always to be checked and evaluated, not to be relied on wholly, much less to be interpreted implicitly in terms of Sir James' own interpretation.

Books Received.—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

BENEDICT, Dom Placid. \$1.00. *Abbey Press*.
CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE, THE. VOLUME V. Edited by H. H. Dodwell. \$7.00. *Macmillan*.
CORPS MYSTIQUE DU CHRIST, L'E. E. Mersch, S.J. 90 francs. *Museum Lessianum*.
FALLOW LAND, THE. H. E. Bates. \$2.50. *Ballou*.
FRA ANGELICO. \$1.00. *Hale, Cushman, and Flint*.
IMPOSSIBLE THINGS AND OTHER ESSAYS. Elizabeth Lowell Everett. \$1.00. *Dorrance*.
LEBEN JESU IM LANDE UND VOLKE ISRAEL, DAS. Von Franz Michel Willam. \$2.25. *Herder*.
"LES ILES." Jacques Maritain. *Desclée de Brouwer*.
LIFE OF FATHER AUGUSTINE BAKER, O.S.B., THE. Father Peter Salvin and Father Serenus Cressy. 6/. *Burns, Oates, and Washbourne*.
MARK TWAIN. Stephen Leacock. \$2.00. *Appleton*.
PRE-REVOLUTIONARY IRISH IN MASSACHUSETTS, THE. George Francis Donovan. *Published by the author*.
PUPPET SHOW. Pauline Follansbee. \$2.00. *Dorrance*.
SOME VICTORIAN AND GEORGIAN CATHOLICS. Patrick Braybrooke. 7/6. *Burns, Oates, and Washbourne*.
TRUE STORY OF THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS, THE. Joseph Tausek. \$1.00. *Dial*.
WEBSTER'S SHORTER SCHOOL DICTIONARY. *American Book Company*.
WHILE THE WORLD REVOLVES. Donald Benedict Christie. 5/. *Burns, Oates, and Washbourne*.
WHY BOTHER WITH OLD-FASHIONED RELIGION? Robert A. Boice. \$1.50. *Dorrance*.

Peter Ashley. The Salutation. The Tartar Slave. Fabian, the Story of a Moralist. Katherine's Lover.

Most of the war books of the past few years have developed the thesis that ideals cannot flourish under the reality of war. They begin with that proposition. "Peter Ashley" (Farrar and Rinehart, \$2.50), by DuBose Heyward, ends with it. Peter Ashley, an idealist, has been sent to Europe by his uncle to study and returns just before the declaration of the Civil War. As he comes into Charleston, S. C., all his friends meet him and let him know that they interpret his return to fight for his home as gallant, a sign of the blood. Peter has no wish to fight. He has been rather convinced in England that slavery is wrong. He determines to stand aside and weigh the matter, to become convinced. A duel results and Peter is badly wounded. But he recovers to find himself in possession of Damaris—and an ardent patriot. You see him going off to war, knowing that he will come back broken, his fine happiness of new love tarnished. The author leaves it there. The story is well written. The characters are convincing, the atmosphere authentic. The horse-race scenes are excellent. Mr. Heyward has added another successor to his eminent "Porgy," and I believe that it is worthy of him.

Sylvia Townsend Warner's latest book, "The Salutation" (Viking Press, \$2.50), contains two psychological novelettes and eleven stories, sketches, and phantasies. Miss Warner has mastered the technique of writing, knows the ins and outs of human character, and has observed nature. It is to be regretted that she permits cheap suggestiveness, false sentimentality, and a facility in telling smoking-room stories as well as a man, to mar her pages. The title novelette describes the search of a bewildered Englishman for alleviation of a deep sorrow, the hospitality extended to him on a South American plantation, and his complex reaction thereto. The other novelette records the history of a murderess, written down, as it were, between sentence and execution. Elinor Barley was a handsome young widow who was overcome by an infatuation for a brute whom she married and whom, driven to desperation by his subtle cruelty, she later killed. The narrative moves straight ahead with simple eloquence, and excels, as does also "The Salutation," in refinements of atmosphere. Yet many readers may prefer the shorter story of the lost London cat that at last found shelter, or the imaginative sketch in which Emily Brontë is made to figure.

"The Tartar Slave" (Stratford, \$2.50), by Oscar Doyle Johnson, is an amateurishly told story of Lucas, the son of one of Tamerlane's chief warriors. The book has nothing to offer either as a novel or as an analysis of the emotional experiences which shape an artist's work. The atmosphere of the times completely eludes the author, and were it not for a few typically medieval terms, one might almost fancy the story were laid in the seventeenth century. The religious feeling is decidedly weak.

"Fabian, The Story of a Moralist" (Dodd, Mead, \$2.50), by Erich Kästner, is just one more of those groveling expositions of the social evil in a big city. It is unrelieved by any romance, untempered by any purpose, and unredeemed by any excellence in translation. The author drags a young man through the typical follies, and then gets rid of him by having him jump into a river to save a child. The child can swim and escapes. The roué, who can no more swim than he can do anything else that is respectable, goes to the bottom.

"Katherine's Lover" (Dial, \$2.00), by Lord Gorell, is an interesting, well-constructed novel. Its title perhaps would suggest that it was merely one of the many current sex-centered books, that so frequently plague the unwary reader. But it is not so. The chief characters are from Scotland, though the scene is laid in England. It is a story of the overthrowing of a hatred planted in early childhood in the heart of the chief character, David. The love of Katherine is constant in the midst of many trials, and brings things finally to a happy solution. It is a clean story, well written, and worth reading by those who care for love-story fiction.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

The Fourth Word

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Perhaps some of your readers would welcome a word on a recent article which has led to many queries. A few Sundays ago a newspaper featured an attack on the genuineness of Christ's words, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" The critic, entitled "a distinguished biblical scholar" (though his name is new to me), is one of a Nestorian group of Assyrian Christians in Kurdistan. This Dr. Lamsa claims to possess an ancient Nestorian manuscript of the Gospels in Aramaic, from which he thus translates the aforesaid words: "My God, this was my destiny, for this I was kept."

That no real difficulty attaches to the words of Christ as we have always received them was shown, I trust, in your columns for March 26, 1932. Apart from that, this new proposal is one of those pseudo-learned sensations which no scholar would even notice had it not been displayed to mislead the public. Three comments may suffice us here:

Dr. Lamsa's whole argument rests on a claim that the Greek Gospels were translated from a lost Aramaic original and by men who did not understand Palestinian Aramaic. Even if the latter circumstance were at all probable, three of the four Gospels were matter of oral tradition for a whole generation before they were put in writing. Their writers had heard Christ's words reported by His Apostles.

Owing to the frequency, acknowledged by all scholars, of deliberate corruptions in the writings of early heretics, a Nestorian version of the Gospels is about the last thing to which any responsible critic would appeal for a trustworthy report of the words of Christ as against the agreement of the best Greek sources. Dr. Lamsa may or may not have translated his source correctly, but it was not worth translating at all for the purpose of the argument attributed to him.

As if this were not enough, he unconsciously betrays his whole claim for the antiquity of his Aramaic source. He supplies a photograph of one passage which is not in the Palestinian Aramaic spoken by Christ but in the later Eastern Aramaic (or "Syriac") of the Christian era. The passage happens to consist of the "Our Father." It closes with the ascription commonly used by Protestants: "For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever." That settles the value of Dr. Lamsa's "Aramaic original." So far from being an early and authentic account of Christ's words in His own language, it is derived from some other translation (probably Greek) and so late that it contains an addition to the "Our Father" which is absent from the best Greek manuscripts and which even Protestant critics have long since abandoned as not original.

The whole performance (especially the simplicity of this last detail) reveals the Assyrian student as possessing knowledge enough to create a cheap sensation in favor of his own preferences—and no more.

Woodstock, Md.

W. H. McCLELLAN, S.J.

Germany and America

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Germany does not claim, as I understand, that she has a technical right to disregard the Versailles Treaty. But all the world knows that the spirit of the Treaty has been disregarded by the other signatories, and Germany claims that under such circumstances her case is entitled to be heard in the court of conscience.

From the beginning of the War until today Germany and Austria were the victims of a monumental campaign of lying and misrepresentation that it may with truth be stated that the Teutonic cause never received a fair hearing from the Allied Powers. America is bound to take a hand in security and justice. Only so can she clear herself of complicity in the great wrong that has been done and is continually being done to Germany and Austria. For among all civilized people there is a latent sense of right which needs only to be awakened to secure justice to the nation that has suffered the deepest wrong known in modern history. In my own view the time is extremely opportune to raise those post-War problems and adjust them on the basis of peace. We must organize and finance the political, industrial, and economic institutions of the resurrected German nation—not as a matter of philanthropy but as an urgent commercial and political business of immense benefit to both the contracting parties. America is chosen to be the warranter and guardian of a just and lasting peace and of the sacredness of international obligations. The question of equality in armaments is wholly within the control of the other Powers. They can bring about real disarmament and thus render Germany's demand a thing of great good instead of a thing of great harm. If the Conference fails, the disarmament cause comes to an ignoble end. The fault will rest with the Allied Powers and not with Germany.

New York.

JOHN STECK.

President Cleveland and Catholics

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In today's issue of your most interesting review your correspondent, Mr. Lawless, writes about an incident in the career of President Cleveland that is not generally known and which indicates that Mr. Cleveland had no hostility to people of the Catholic faith. In this connection it is interesting to recall that the late Frederic R. Coudert, according to the "Catholic Encyclopedia," was offered a place on the bench of the United States Supreme Court. Is it not exceedingly probable that such a tender was made by President Cleveland, Mr. Coudert and the President having been of the same political faith as well as contemporaries (the famous international lawyer was born in 1832, while the man who dropped the name "Stephen" was born in 1837)?

Glen Cove, N. Y.

JOHN P. MCCARTHY.

Zealous Zealander

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Will you please accept this humble tribute from a New Zealand admirer. I doubt very much if any periodical or journal that comes to this fair Dominion attains the consistently high level of clear thinking, fearlessness, and literary excellence of your review. Catholic and non-Catholic subscribers are under a deep debt of gratitude to your contributors, who are making the very best use of their God-given talents to instruct and lead their fellow brethren.

Permit me, with M. E. G., of Buffalo, in her letter to the Editor (November 5, 1932), to add my tribute that Father Talbot in his contribution "Black Vestments" reached the high water mark in "prose poems."

Christchurch, N. Z.

E. T. LAYBURN.

Wanted: Copies of "Thought"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The issue of *Thought* for September, 1932, has been completely sold out. We are receiving rather urgent requests for copies of this issue.

If any readers of AMERICA have copies of this issue with which they are willing to part, I would ask that they communicate with me at 461 Eighth Avenue.

New York.

(REV.) F. P. LeBUFFE, S.J.
Business Manager, America Press